

# THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D. D., Editor

May 1919

20 Cents

Vol. 5 No. 3

|                                               |         |     |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------|-----|
| Editorial Comment                             | - - - - | 727 |
| The Open Pulpit                               | - - - - | 735 |
| <i>The Bishop of Vermont</i>                  |         |     |
| I Believe in the Holy Catholic Church. Part I |         | 745 |
| <i>James H. Flye</i>                          |         |     |
| The Reformed Episcopal Church                 | - -     | 764 |
| <i>Arthur Whipple Jenks</i>                   |         |     |
| Leo Tolstoy and Christianity                  | - -     | 779 |
| <i>Clarence Augustus Manning</i>              |         |     |
| The Function of the Theological Seminary      | -       | 792 |
| <i>Neil Edmund Stanley</i>                    |         |     |
| Some Fruits of Parochialism                   | - - -   | 800 |
| <i>Albert C. Larned</i>                       |         |     |
| Lecture Platform or Pulpit?                   | - - -   | 806 |
| <i>Clere Unwin</i>                            |         |     |
| For What Does the Prayer Book Stand?          | -       | 809 |
| <i>Henry K. Pierce</i>                        |         |     |
| Book Reviews                                  | - - - - | 815 |

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under Act of March 3, 1897

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 42 Albany Street  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager



## The Century of Hope

*A Sketch of Western Progress from 1815 to the Great War.*

By F. S. MARVIN. 360 pages. Net \$3.00.

*Contents:* The Legacy of the Revolution; The Political Revival; The New Spirit in Literature; The Birth of Socialism; Mechanical Science and Invention; Biology and Evolution; Nationality and Imperialism; Schools for All; Religious Growth; New Knowledge on Old Foundations; The Expansion of the West; Social Progress; International Progress.

## The Society of Nations

By T. J. LAWRENCE, LL.D., formerly Professor of International Law, University of Chicago. 205 pages. Net \$1.50.

Traces the growth of the Society of Nations from its origin to the present, indicating some solutions to present world problems.

"An excellent history of international law for the general reader who wishes to inform himself as to the historic backgrounds of a League of Nations."—*N. Y. Sun*.

## A Republic of Nations

A Study of the Organization of a Federal League of Nations based on the Constitution of the United States. By RALEIGH C. MINOR. 346 pages. Net \$2.50.

"A book that must be read by every serious student of the most important issue now before the world."—*New York Evening Post*.

## Russia

From the Varangians to the Bolsheviks. By RAYMOND BEAZLEY, NEVILL FORBES and G. A. BIRKETT. Pp. xxii+602, with 6 maps. Net \$4.25.

"Invaluable to the student of history, of diplomacy, of politico-sociology, or what not, who wishes to trace the devious and obscure influences which have in the last year been manifested in one of the most extraordinary revolutions the world has known."—*New York Tribune*.

## The Eastern Question

By J. A. R. MARRIOTT. Second edition revised, with eleven maps and appendixes, giving a list of the Ottoman rulers, and the shrinkage of the Ottoman Empire in Europe, 1871-1914. 550 pages. Net \$4.25.

A systematic account of the origin and development of the Eastern Question, dealing successively with the Ottomans, Hapsburgs, Russian Empire, the Hellenic Kingdom and the New Balkan States, with an epilogue brought down to June, 1918.

"Professor Marriott presents a clear, scholarly and accurate account of Balkan problems from the Turks' first European activity to the zenith of Constantine's recent high-handedness in Greece."—*New York Sun*.

*At All Booksellers or from the Publishers.*

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

**A M E R I C A N   B R A N C H**

**Thirty-five West Thirty-second Street, New York**





# New Publications of Morehouse Publishing Co.,

Milwaukee,  
Wis.

## The Faith by Which We Live

A Plain, Practical Exposition of the Religion of the Incarnate Lord. By the **Rev. CHARLES FISKE, D.D., LL.D.**, Bishop Coadjutor of Central New York. Cloth, 336 pages, \$1.50, postage about 9c. additional.

"I do not like," the author says in his preface, "to call this a manual of instruction. It is that, but I hope it is more. It is a plain, practical, common-sense exposition of the Christian Faith, written in language that the average, every-day man can understand; but it is not—or I hope it is not—just a summary and explanation of a series of dry doctrines. It is both creed and conduct, belief and practice, dogma and devotion—a statement of faith, but the statement of a faith by which men live."

## The Church at Work in College and University

By the **Rev. PAUL MICOU, D.D.**, Secretary of the Department of Collegiate Education, G. B. R. E. Put forth by the National Student Council of the Episcopal Church. Cloth, \$1.00, postage about 10c. additional.

Work among college students has been among the chief anxieties of Churchmen in recent years. Many attempts have been made, most of which have proven failures. Little opportunity has arisen to study the subject, because there was no available material. For several years the G. B. R. E. has devoted particular attention to it, and has assigned the **Rev. Paul Micou** to a serious study of the subject in all its phases. This book, the result of such study, is therefore a pioneer in a new field of literature.

## A Book of Collects

In two Parts. Part I—New Collects. Part II—Adapted Collects, derived from Sources for the most part Ancient. By **PATER and FILIUS**. Cloth, 50c., postage about 5c. additional.

The authors of this little book are true liturgical scholars, as would be recognized if their names might be used. They remain anonymous in order that their work may be judged on its merits. Certainly the felicitous language in which the new collects are cast is bound to strike every thoughtful reader. The book is an admirable addition to the devotional literature of the Church and to her liturgiology.

## Talking With God

Some Suggestions for the Practice of Private Prayer. By **J. J. KENSINGTON**. With an introduction by the **VERY REV. EDMUND S. ROUSMANIERE, D.D.**, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, Boston. Paper, 30c.; cloth, 60c.; postage about 3c. additional.

"This," writes Dean Rousmaniere, "is the most useful book on prayer with which I am acquainted. It deepens the desire to pray, by describing in real and simple terms the reasonableness and the beauty of communion with God. But it does much more; for it meets the question which great numbers of men and women are asking—*How shall I pray?* Whoever will follow the practical suggestions which the author makes, will surely find in his own experience, step by step, that when we speak, God hears and answers."

# The Religion of the Prayer Book

By the **Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D.**  
the **Rev. Selden P. Delany, D.D.**

12 mo. About 274 pages. Cloth. Price, \$1.75

"Some years ago I gave to a young Roman Priest a copy of our Prayer Book. At our next meeting, he put to me this query: 'Do you know that your Mass is Catholic?' I replied: 'That was the intention.' This Catholic Intention of our Book of Common Prayer is the central idea of this invaluable book, by two of our Priests who are unusually well equipped to speak on this subject. What gives this volume its great value for the practical Christian, is that it shows how the Prayer Book is the living source of a vital religion that will give him strength and guidance for his every-day living in accordance with the Will of God. The book is most charmingly written, and holds the interest of the reader from the first word to the last."—*F. C. H. W.*

**EDWIN S. GORHAM, Publisher**

11 West 45th St.

New York

THIRD YEAR

## A Worth While Magazine

A good word ought to be spoken for the AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY.

"It improves with each issue and ought to be read by thinking laymen as well as by the clergy." — *Diocesan Record, R. I.*

## The American Church Monthly

FROM SUBSCRIBERS.

NEW YORK.

"I read the Magazine with keen interest and pass it on. It deserves the support of all good Churchmen."

WISCONSIN.

"I gladly enclose my yearly subscription to the AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY, as I consider Dr. Barry's article, in the last issue (February number), alone worth the price. It was capital."

IOWA.

"A word of congratulation on the character of the Magazine, and the decided Catholic position it holds."

COLORADO.

"I take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of this most excellent Magazine. I am situated forty-five miles from the nearest railroad station, and seventy-five miles from my nearest brother Priest. . . ."

"I read the AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY from cover to cover, and enjoy its wholesome, definite tone."

Two Dollars a Year

Twenty Cents Single Copy

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager

11 West 45th Street

New York



# The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing  
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion  
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

*President:* GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

*Vice-President:* GUY VAN AMRINGE, 55 Liberty Street, New York

*Secretary:* THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

*Treasurer:* HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year

Twenty Cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

---

Volume V

MAY, 1919

Number 3

---

## The Real Point at Issue

**I**N the controversy over the "open pulpit" it is quite natural that strong feelings should be aroused on both sides. It seems to many in the Church that those who favor the open pulpit are disloyal to the principles of the Church, and playing fast and loose with the valuable heritage which has come to us through the ages. On the other hand, those who are in favor of the open pulpit no doubt consider their accusers bigoted and narrow-minded and cold-hearted for opposing so kindly and charitable an act as inviting ministers of all denominations to preach in our pulpits. We believe that each side is mistaken in imputing such motives to the other side; as each side is acting in a way that is perfectly consistent with its fundamental principles. It may clear the air therefore if we go back to fundamentals and try to find out what is the real point at issue.

The real issue is between two divergent answers which are given to one of the most fundamental questions in religion, namely, Has the revealed truth of God been committed to the Church to be taught to men? This question goes to the root of all our thinking about religion, and the answer we give it will determine very largely what views we shall take on most of the spiritual and religious controversies of our time.

If the revelation of God has not been entrusted to the Church, then of course it follows that each man has pretty much the right to believe and do as he thinks best. For in that case we are all searching for satisfactory interpretations of Holy Scripture; we are simply making the quest along different paths, and therefore one man's answer is as good as another's. Naturally therefore it can make little difference what we believe so long as we are sincere and are trying to do the best we can. Whether a man goes to church or stays away is of little importance; nor can it be vitally necessary that one should belong to a church at all.

If we start from the assumption that God has not committed His truth to the Church to be preserved intact through the ages and taught to the faithful, then the problem of Christian unity becomes extremely simple. It becomes merely a problem of gathering all Christian sects together in one loving and sympathetic brotherhood without paying much attention to matters of creed or belief, and allowing their spiritual leaders to teach whatever they consider true, and giving complete freedom to every individual to interpret the Bible in his own way and to construct his own religion for himself. If we thus accord to all the right of private judgment in matters of religion there would seem to be no good reason why we should not have Christian unity tomorrow.



By the same token the missionary problem would become equally simple. It would become simply by vanishing entirely. For if we are not certain of any sacred deposit or tradition in matters of faith then we have no definite gospel to carry to the heathen world and it would be far better to allow all races to continue to practice such religions as they have evolved, which they think have served them fairly well for many centuries. They too have been seeking to interpret God's revelation in their own way and they have as much right to their conclusions as we have to ours. Why not simply send several shiploads of Bibles and let the heathen interpret them as they will?

On the other hand, if we proceed on the assumption that God has revealed Himself, and that His revelation is contained in the Divine tradition of the Church, then it must be our supreme concern in life to find out what the Church teaches and having found it to defend it loyally against all attacks. The faith that was revealed by God and once for all delivered to the saints to be faithfully preserved and taught throughout the centuries becomes our criterion in all perplexities of belief and conduct. We have no right to invent a religion of our own by selecting various items of doctrine from various ancient and modern religious teachers. Nor have we any right to believe merely what we like or what we think to be true. We are simply interested in getting at the facts. The main question is, What has the Church handed down to us as the revealed truth of God? If we believe that that truth is summed up in what we call the Catholic Faith, then we ought to be willing to make any necessary sacrifice to spread that faith throughout the world. Furthermore we cannot conceive of any Christian unity worth talking about that is not based upon a thorough agreement as to the principles of faith and order that

have come down to us from the beginning of the Church's history.

It is not at all surprising that those who believe that God's revealed truth is authoritatively taught by the Church, and those who believe that it is not, should disagree violently on almost all matters of religious controversy. The surprising thing is that they can continue to practice their religion in the same Church. It may be that we are rapidly approaching the parting of the ways when all people in the world who believe in the authority of the Church and accept the Church's traditional faith as the truth God has made known to men will be banded together in one Church, and those who believe that each man must rely upon his own private judgment in matters of faith will unite in some sort of Pan-Protestant church which will embrace every possible variety of belief and practice.

---

### Ecclesiastical Pacifists

**WE** all had a good taste of pacifism during the war. There were many leaders of public opinion, especially among the radical elements of our population and radical teachers of religion, who felt that we were making the supreme blunder when we entered the war. If we had accepted their advice and followed their leadership German militarism would today be ruling the world. It was only by a hairbreadth escape that the ideals and traditions that we most cherish were preserved from utter destruction. These pacifists preferred anything to war, even the invasion of America and bringing this great people into ignominious subjection to the most unscrupulous autocrat of modern times. Fortunately there were enough people in this country who preferred anything, even the destruction of the flower of our young manhood, to a peace of wickedness and cruelty and dishonor.



Pacifism is by no means dead. One would suppose that as a working philosophy of life it would have spiritually disappeared after the world had learned to appraise it at its true valuation. It is now however lifting up its head in the Church. There are those in high position in the Church, and rectors of prominent parishes and editors of Church newspapers who are telling us that we must have peace among Christians at any price. They are trying to persuade us that Christian unity is a supreme need of our time and that we must be willing to pay the price for it, even if it mean the throwing over of all the supernatural elements in our religion. We are told that especially in the season of Holy Week we should be glad to welcome in our pulpits the teachers of those denominations which have rejected much of the spiritual heritage that we have long regarded as our most valued possession.

The *Churchman* of March 15th says: "If there is any season of the Christian year that silences by its memories and its teaching those unlovely controversies over the validity of orders and our claim to hold precisely 'the faith once delivered to the saints,'—it is that season when Jesus set his face towards Jerusalem to be put to death by that very spirit which in all ages has mistaken orthodoxy for truth, ecclesiasticism for religion, logic for the love that is in Christ Jesus." If this is not pacifism in the Church we do not know pacifism when we see it. We are convinced that this pacifism is as great a peril to the life of the Church as the pro-German pacifism was to the life of the nation. There is a call to battle sounding forth today in the Church. Every loyal Churchman who realizes that the old faith is at stake must answer that call in no uncertain way. Once again we must all range ourselves either on the side of those who want peace at any price or on the side of those who are



willing to follow in the steps of the martyrs. It is fortunate for us today that S. Athanasius was not a pacifist. He stood for the orthodox faith against the whole world. It is chiefly because of his action that we are able today to believe in Christ as the divine Saviour of the world. The advice of some modern teachers of religion that we should hold our tongues and dwell together amicably with those who teach another Gospel may at times seem very plausible. We for our part prefer to heed the advice of the holy apostle S. Jude that "Ye should earnestly contend for the faith that was once delivered unto the saints."

There are two kinds of pacifists represented in the Church. On the one hand there are those who at the first sound of battle would weakly surrender their position and seek the peace and safety that they think they will find in the mighty fortress of Rome. There are others who would urge us to throw over the episcopate and priesthood and the sacraments and eucharistic worship and the religious life as so much worthless cargo and transfer ourselves as quickly as possible to the new and untried ship of Pan-Protestantism.

There are still some left in the Church, both among the clergy and among the laity, who do not propose to surrender. They refuse to be frightened by the threats of the pacifists. They intend, by God's help, to stay where they are, and fight to the bitter end for the revealed religion of the Gospel, "as this Church hath received the same."

---

### Some Episcopal Difficulties

**I**T is related of the Greek philosopher Diogenes that, when he was asked why philosophers followed the rich while the rich did not follow the philosophers, he replied that it



was because the philosophers knew what they needed and the rich did not.

This wise remark of Diogenes may perhaps be quoted in justification of not a few bishops and other dignitaries in the Church, whose opinions and public utterances sometimes appear to be dictated by a desire to please the possessors of large fortunes. No doubt our Lord sometimes seems far away, but the rich are always with us; and when money is so sorely needed for vast ecclesiastical enterprises, it must be a real temptation for those in authority to say and do what will win the applause of the rich. There is a danger in currying the favor of the rich that the Church may lose the poor and the common people. One shudders to think what fate is in store for the Church of the rich and the respectable classes in the coming days of democratic equality, when there will be no one left who is either rich or respectable.

There is also the danger that in becoming so broad-minded that we appeal to all denominations of Christians, we may lose the support of those who are still narrow-minded enough to cling to the notion that we must contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

May we respectfully suggest to our rulers in the Church that they ponder over the old, familiar fable about the dog with a bone in his mouth, walking along a board over a stream of water? He paused to look at his reflection in the water, and in his excitement he dropped the bone he had in his mouth and jumped into the stream to grab the bone which the other dog was carrying. He lost the bone he had and he gained no other.

It is not merely a question of money, but a question also of souls. There are strangely enough many men and women who will lose all interest in the Anglican Church



just as soon as it becomes broad enough and hazy enough in its dogmatic position to include every possible variety of Christians. We may think that we shall win many new adherents by our generous and charitable attitude; whereas the chief result will be that we shall lose most of those that we already have.

---

### Making Worship Vital

MANY suggestions for improving the worship of the Church have been inspired by the religious problems connected with the war. Chaplains both in the American army and in the British army have revealed some of the depressing conditions they have had to meet and have outlined the remedy. "The Church in the Furnace" is perhaps the best example of a collection of articles by chaplains dealing with these subjects. The report of the Archbishops' Second Committee of Inquiry on "The Worship of the Church" also contains many very valuable hints. This report is not exclusively English as one might suppose. It applies almost equally well to conditions in the American Church.

Before we enter rashly upon any changes in our system of worship, it might be well for us to see if we could not make our worship more vital by taking the proper measures to vitalize the worshippers. If more of our clergy preached the gospel and instructed their people in the rudiments of the Catholic faith, instead of preaching only on the war and the league of nations and industrial problems and social reform, the results would certainly be astonishing. A little of the old-fashioned gospel, laying stress upon repentance, salvation through Christ, and the preaching of the Cross, would go a long way towards arousing a new enthusiasm and zeal in the members of the Church.

Furthermore much might be done by the clergy themselves in bringing their own lives more into harmony with the will of God and becoming more genuinely converted men. Would that we had a S. Vincent de Paul in this country today to reform the lives of our clergy! When he began his work in France in the sixteenth century a surprisingly large number of the clergy were illiterate and totally without any interest in religion, while many of them were living lives of drunkenness and debauchery. When he ended his work the state of the clergy in France was completely altered. We are not suggesting that the clergy of the American Church have as a class fallen into so degraded a state, but we do believe that valuable results would be secured if more of our clergy lived under rule, made at least an annual retreat, practiced sacramental confession, and if we could have a widespread revival of the religious life for men.

There are however some changes that might be made in the practical system of worship that would ultimately result in making our church services more stimulating and inspiring and attractive. The chief thing that is needed is to make the Lord's service of the Holy Eucharist central in our system of worship. The report of the Archbishop's Committee lays a great deal of stress upon this particular point. It says:

"It is almost universally felt that the Communion service has fallen out of its proper place in the scheme of worship. Church-going has largely come to mean attendance at services such as Matins and Evensong, and the Holy Communion has been driven into the position of an exceptional service requiring certain definite convictions and special efforts such as are not expected of the average member of the Church. It is clear that this is a serious misfortune."



We believe that it is very widely recognized in this country both by the clergy and the laity that our present practice is abnormal and not in keeping with the traditional usage of the Church from the earliest days. Many would desire to restore the Lord's service at once to its rightful place as the chief act of worship on Sunday morning. It is however extremely difficult to change suddenly the habits of devotion of a large section of our people. What can be done? We would suggest that to make the Eucharist the chief act of worship does not necessarily mean making it the service at which the largest number of people are present. It would seem to be desirable that in many parishes the Eucharist should be celebrated at an early hour, say 8 or 8.30, with simple music that could be sung by the people, and with a sermon. All present should be given the opportunity to receive the sacrament. The priest in his teaching and in preparing people for confirmation should emphasize the fact that this is the chief act of worship at which all faithful and devout Christians should be present every Sunday. There could be however at a later hour, say 10.30 or 11, other services, preferably not Matins however, consisting chiefly of hymns and prayers, which would be constructed with a view of supplying a simple service of prayer and praise for the large mass of unconverted people who are connected with the parish. This might easily in many parishes include some of the members of the Vestry! In this service the chief stress would be laid upon the sermon. Then in the afternoon there could be Vespers with a short address for the faithful who have been present at the morning Eucharist; and in the evening there could be some effort made to have a popular service which would attract the unchurched and the unbeliever. Perhaps a Sunday evening forum would be as good as anything for this purpose.

It seems to us that we must face the fact that there are two distinct classes of people connected with every parish: one is the class of earnest, devout, converted souls, who wish to practice the Christian religion in its entirety; the other is the class of careless, unconverted, worldly, and often unbelieving people who have only the slightest hold upon the Church and who as they are at present constituted want as little religion as possible. Obviously it is impossible to find a form of worship that will appeal equally to both these classes.



## The Open Pulpit

BY THE RIGHT REV. ARTHUR C. A. HALL, D.D.

THE question of the Open Pulpit is again forced upon us. Of late years we have, alas! become accustomed in New York to what looks like ostentatious flouting of the Church's law on all sorts of points, without at any rate any public rebuke by the diocesan authorities; but the action of the Bishop in arranging for ministers of different religious bodies, none of them in communion with this Church, to make addresses in his cathedral on the several days of Holy Week, is a distinct challenge to the Church, as was the action of the Bishop of Massachusetts last summer in the matter of the Cambridge Conference Communion. If such action by leading Bishops is tacitly allowed, or not authoritatively repudiated, the Episcopal Church will be practically committed to a policy which will forfeit the allegiance of many of her most devoted children.

Unhappily the example set in New York, or conspicuously illustrated there, is according to report being followed in a good many other places and dioceses, and is apparently favored by some whose approval or consent would not have been thought likely.

It is difficult for some of us to remain calm in view of what is being done; but let us try to consider the matter dispassionately, with the various pleas that are urged on behalf of this Open policy.

I. Appeal is made by some to the Prophetic and so-called Charismatic ministry in the early Christian Church. The nature and position of the Prophetic office, as set forth for instance in *The Didache*, has been amply discussed of late, in particular by Dr. Armitage Robinson in the volume of *Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry*

edited by Dr. Swete, and reviewed in the *American Church Monthly* for October last. It is unnecessary here to say more than that, whatever was the position of the Prophets, two things are clear: (1) where they were present their ministrations were not limited; they celebrated the liturgy and generally presided in the assemblies of the faithful, taking precedence of the settled and local ministry. If the Use of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine is based on the recognition of distinguished Presbyterian, Congregational and Methodist ministers as charismatic prophets, these authorities, or one of them, should displace the Bishop at the Easter or Maundy Thursday Eucharist, and not be restricted to addressing the congregation at afternoon services. (2) The Prophets were not visitors from outside the communion in which they ministered, belonging to external bodies, with varying forms of belief and practice; they belonged to the same household of faith, enforcing the accepted faith with special fervor and demonstration of the Spirit.

II. Apart from what may perhaps be considered anti-quarian considerations concerning technical "Prophets," preaching, it is said, is not a distinctly priestly function. Perhaps not; the example of St. Stephen and the Friars would point that way. But in our ordinal it is the Priest who is solemnly commissioned to be "a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God" as well as "of his holy Sacraments." The Priest is, under the Bishop, the ordinary teacher and instructor of the people committed to his spiritual charge. He may call in the assistance of others, for whose teaching in a general way he will remain responsible. Deacons and laymen who have been allowed at different times and under varying regulation to preach, were always in communion with the Church, and subject to its discipline. Our Lay



Readers must be communicants of the Church, licensed by the Bishop, acting under his direction or that of a Priest having jurisdiction in the place, and they are only authorized to deliver sermons or addresses of their own if, after instruction and examination, they are specially licensed thereto. The question before us is of inviting men who are professedly and officially representatives of religious bodies organized in separation from the Church, from which on principle they conscientiously differ. Apart from the question of "commission" there is the requirement that those who teach and speak in the Church's name should be "tried and examined" by her authorities. And if it is said that of course the Bishop of New York would invite to the Cathedral pulpit only eminent representatives of so-called orthodox religious bodies, exercising himself a responsible selection, what guarantee is there that in this or that other diocese or community the same sort of selection would be exercised, or would be possible? If "ministers of other denominations" may, as such, be admitted to preach in our congregations, where shall a line be drawn without danger at least of affront to ministers or denominations?

III. It has been pleaded that we are greatly indebted to the writings of ministers not of our communion, that our clergy largely use their books—commentaries, sermons, etc.—in their preparation for preaching; why not then allow the men themselves to speak to us? Surely the fallacy is obvious. We may helpfully and gratefully make use of such material. But the responsibility for its use rests with the preacher, who is bound by his promise of conformity to the Church's doctrine, discipline and worship. He must sift the material and choose what he considers fitting. Some clergymen may be greatly helped, in their own lives and in their preaching, by the sermons and devotional writ-

ings of Roman Catholic authors. But they would be reckoned bound to omit from their borrowing what was distinctly Romish, and not to teach, for instance, as of faith the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, nor to urge the advantages of indulgences. Nor would an Eastern enthusiast be entitled to preach against the *Filioque* in the creed. The principle of discrimination and selection then is recognized in the use of material borrowed from those who are not subject to our obligations or restrictions. But ministers who are invited to come to deliver their own message cannot, and certainly should not, be expected to leave out the distinctive parts of their message, those points of belief or practice for which their communions particularly stand—unless they too have given up all definite and real belief in their tenets!

IV. But it is said, Whether you like it or not, a canon (once notorious as number nineteen, but now changed in enumeration to twenty) expressly provides that on *Special Occasions* Christian men, who are not ministers of this Church, may be allowed by the Bishop to make addresses in the Church. Whether an ordinary Sunday forenoon service can be honestly reckoned a "Special Occasion" in the meaning of the canon, or a Good Friday afternoon, may be left to the judgment of ordinary persons. The phrase in the context would naturally be interpreted as referring to a gathering in the church, not for the regular worship, but for some great charitable or educational or civic purpose, or for an historical commemoration, when an expert, apart from any question of his ecclesiastical affiliation or status, might be invited to make an address, like Sir Herbert Tree and Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson at the Shakespeare Ter-centenary in the New York Cathedral.



V. The precedent of the War is invoked, and the disregard of ecclesiastical lines in camp and at the front. About this two remarks may be made. (1) Under actual conditions this was unavoidable with army and navy chaplains appointed by the State in some supposed proportion to the number of soldiers and sailors belonging to different religious bodies. Are anomalies of necessity submitted to under military rule to be voluntarily introduced into our settled ecclesiastical usage?

(2) The war precedent (like the appeal to the status of "Prophets") would go a good deal further than some perceive or probably intend. We recollect reading in the papers of the dedication of a building intended for religious and recreational purposes at a camp not far from New York, at which all sorts of chaplains and ministers officiated (perhaps under military orders), the rector of Trinity Church being sandwiched in between a Roman Catholic priest and a Jewish rabbi, who gave the benediction. Are there not commissioned, or at any rate appointed, chaplains from among Christian Scientists and Mormons? Are we prepared to accept the leadership of the largest body or of the senior minister in a community? Again, where can a line be drawn?

VI. There is the Cry of Despair. Something must be done. The need is so great for Christians to get together in the face of formidable and determined foes to Christian faith and Christian life. We have talked too long about reunion. By some action we must shew that we are really in earnest in our professed desire for union. But what is it we are in earnest about? Is it not world-wide reunion of the *whole* of Christendom? Are we to be content with anything short of this, with mere Federation instead of reunion (as a *plan*), or with the union of Protestant or Evangelical Churches (as marking its *extent*)?

Let us be clear that so far from a Federation of Evangelical Churches being a step towards the reunion of the whole of Christendom, it would indefinitely postpone the realization of the better and bigger hope, and would quite definitely rule out the Episcopal or Anglican Church (if this were included in the Federation) from its boasted position of mediation between the historical and the reformed communions. It is all very well to welcome to our churches with respectful greetings Eastern prelates; but we can no more expect them than Latin authorities to enter into serious negotiations with us if they see that we throw in our lot with Protestants and practically repudiate the necessity of an apostolic commission. Our plans and invitations for a World Conference for the discussion of questions concerning Faith and Order that now divide Christendom are doomed to disappointment, if in anticipation of these discussions we stir up fresh trouble by opening our pulpits to preachers of various denominations, and by eccentric devices for the ordination of men who shall be half within and half without the Church, owning a sort of allegiance to a Bishop whose authority is not recognized by these to whom they minister. It is in the interest of real unity that we put aside these makeshifts, which are bound to cause divisions among ourselves and to hinder, not help, reunion on the wider scale.

VII. It may be that some feel the above and like excuses to be unnecessary, though perhaps useful. The Open Pulpit is the means which they take to assert their principle of ministerial equality, that the "organization" of Christian Churches is a mere matter of convenience, preference, or historical association, that the Protestant Episcopal is one among several sister Protestant Churches, rather more highly organized than others, while with considerably



freer interpretation and laxer enforcement of its standards. This may be the conscious or subconscious motive impelling some advocates of these irregularities. (This word does still apply.) They are determined in practice to impose this interpretation upon our formularies, and (however kindly and gently) to render a Catholic position untenable. Very well, let this be clearly understood, and we shall know where to take our places. We will contend for what we believe to be the truth. But we are not all of us individualists. We have insisted on this or that rule or doctrine because it was the teaching of the Church, not because it represented our opinion. There are numerous and devoted members of the Episcopal Church who will not be contented with Pan-Protestantism, nor be able to retain allegiance to a Church which has belied its own professions, and broken away from historical Christianity. Systems which speak with authority (though it be exaggerated), and which enforce discipline (even if sometimes harshly) will attract those who are repelled by unprincipled laxity. Others, whose knowledge and conscience would not permit subscription to the creed of Pius IV, and who recognize that Anglican laxity does not justify Papal claims, may find themselves obliged (at whatever cost to themselves and to others) to resign responsible positions of authority, if the Church in whose name they would teach and rule fails them or negatives their witness.

Speaking thus plainly, and with a full sense of responsibility for his words, the writer cannot in frankness refrain from an appeal to Churchmen who would in general agree with what has been said, to consider their own policy and to abstain, at any cost of personal preference, from lines of action which are also, if not equally, inconsistent with our existing standards of doctrine, discipline and worship

(to which we in Holy Orders have promised conformity). It is the vagaries and claims for absolute toleration, or license, on both or on all sides which render it extraordinarily difficult for those in authority to restrain plain departures from the Church's law, and which furnish a reply to complaints concerning these violations. A policy of drift is encouraged, allowing every man to do and teach what he conscientiously thinks he may. This forfeits allegiance within, and exposes us quite naturally to ridicule and scorn from without.

---

## I Believe in the Holy Catholic Church

BY THE REV. JAMES H. FLYE.

### I.

**I**N the shortest official statement in which a member of the Anglican Church can express his religious faith, i. e., the Apostles' Creed, are these words, "I believe in . . . the Holy Catholic Church." What is this Holy Catholic Church, belief in which is ranked with belief in the Trinity and the Resurrection as one of the fundamental articles of the Christian Faith?

An answer to this question is possible only on the basis of an historical survey. In order really to understand any existing condition or institution it is necessary to consider its origin and development. If therefore, beginning from our Lord's time we trace the course of Christianity down to the present, we shall have a clear view of the existing religious situation which otherwise seems so perplexing and confused, and obtain the answer to our question; for having seen, as it is easy to do, what constituted the Catholic Church in the early centuries, we can by tracing the



historic continuity of that Church to the present time identify it now.

As a result of the teachings and work of Christ, there came into existence an organized society of those who accepted and followed His teachings. This society was the Christian Church. The precise nature of its origin has been a subject of controversy: whether He Himself ordered the details of its organization, or whether this was done by the Apostles whom He had trained. The difference, however, seems insignificant. It amounts to the same thing in the end. One thing is certain. Our Lord made provision for the carrying on of His work. And indeed we would certainly expect this to be the case. Considering who He was, incarnate God come to earth to reveal to mankind truths important for their eternal welfare,—to give them, too, not only knowledge but spiritual power and life,—considering this, it is inconceivable that He should not have provided for the correct transmission of His teachings and of the means of help that He came to give. We should certainly expect, then, that definite means would be instituted by Him for this purpose.

This expectation is confirmed when we turn to the historical record. Christ did not simply scatter His teachings broadcast and at random. He did speak, it is true, as opportunity offered, to the earnest enquirer personally, and to the multitudes; but besides this He chose certain men, the Apostles, and associated them closely with Himself for three years of personal training. Many things which they did not fully understand at the time were made clear in the light of His resurrection. Added to this they had His teaching during the forty days following, when He was with them, "speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." (Acts 1:3.) And then, at Pentecost, ten

days after the Ascension, they received yet further enlightenment and power by the gift of the Holy Spirit Who was to guide them into all truth. Moreover, Christ had Himself commissioned them with authority. "As My Father hath sent Me," He had said, "even so send I you" (St. John 20:21), and He had sent them forth to give His Gospel to the world. Thus trained and thus empowered they began the propagation of Christianity, teaching and administering sacraments. The teaching of the Christian Faith was positive, definite, authoritative; a propaganda not of the ideas of the Apostles, but of a Gospel which they had received. The Lord had bidden them go and make disciples of all nations, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (St. Matt. 28:20.) And so they did.

We have, then, the Christian Church, the body of believers. We can see that the Apostles held in it a position of authority, but it is not proposed to discuss here the question of the ministry of the Church at the beginning. The important thing here is simply to note the fact that as a result of the teaching and work of Christ the Church came into existence. In the year 40 A. D., for example, there was in the world a society of people whose religious belief was that received by them as the teaching of incarnate God, who had lived in Palestine and had been crucified and had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven ten years before. This same society, the Christian Church, with increased membership, was in existence in the year 50, 60, 80, 100.

There was no difficulty, then, in the first century, in identifying the Church. It was plainly one fellowship of those who held the faith taught them as that delivered by Christ to the Apostles, and who were endeavoring to live by the principles which Christ taught.



There were, to be sure, a few individuals and groups here and there who while calling themselves Christians rejected the teaching of the Apostles in certain matters, and set up their own opinions, but such persons were by this very fact self-condemned. St. John writes of such, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." (I St. John 2:19.) St. Paul speaks of those who "have erred concerning the faith" (I Tim. 1:19 and 6:21), and directs Titus "a man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject." (Titus 3:10.) He warns the Galatians against those who teach some variant doctrine, and says, "though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1:8.) We read in the Second Epistle of St. Peter (2:1) that "there shall be false teachers among you who privily shall bring in damnable heresies," and St. Jude, warning against false teachers, urges Christians that they "earnestly contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." (Jude 3.)

Clearly, then, there existed in the first century (a) on the one hand the organized body of those who followed the Apostles in doctrine, discipline and worship, i. e., the Church which Christ founded through His Apostles, and (b) various sects or denominations of those who called themselves Christians and no doubt considered that they were following Christ, but who differed from the doctrines and practice taught by the Apostles whom Christ had commissioned. And it is to be noted that the Apostles—men who had been trained by Christ Himself, who had seen Him after His resurrection, and had received the power and

illumination of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, whom Christ had commissioned and empowered as the official teachers of His Gospel, and who must have known if ever any men could what that Gospel was and what His aims and His spirit were—these Apostles showed no tolerance whatsoever of divergence from the doctrines which they had been commissioned to teach. They repudiated with energy the idea of religious differences being insignificant.

The reason for this uncompromising attitude is one which it is very important to realize. It is simply the principle which guides the action of an honorable man in the case of a trust. The Christianity which the Apostles and those acting under their direction were teaching was not a matter of their opinions or speculations. If it had been, men of their good sense and good will would gladly have allowed freedom of thought and welcomed the contribution of the ideas of others. The reason that the Apostles were so dogmatic, and showed such hostility to differences from their doctrine was simply that the religion which they were teaching was not one which had grown out of their own speculations, but one which had been revealed by incarnate God, who had solemnly commissioned and charged them to teach it to the world,—a divine propaganda. “As My Father hath sent Me,” He had said, “even so I send you.” “He that heareth you heareth Me.” “Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Such a body of doctrine was no mere human opinion, perhaps true, perhaps false; it was absolute truth, divinely revealed. The warrant for their teaching was not “we think,” but “our Lord taught.” “That which we have seen and heard



declare we unto you that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." (I St. John 1:13.) St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received" (I Cor. 15:3), and to Timothy, "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." (II Tim. 2:2.) In the sphere of opinion differences were quite legitimate; but in the sphere of the Christian Faith Christ's appointed agents and teachers would have felt themselves false to a divinely committed and all-important trust unless they had used every effort to guard the faith from admixture or subtraction or perversion. Indifference to heresy would have been betrayal of their Lord's trust.

But what was to be done when questions arose, as with the passing of the years and the experience of new conditions the faith was subjected to scrutiny and attack, and deductions and applications were made necessary?

Obviously unless the work of incarnate God was to fail, the agency which He left in the world to teach His Gospel must continue to set forth that Gospel correctly. And the Church felt sure that it would be guided in such a way as to insure this. Christ had said of His Church, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (St. Matt. 16:18), and had promised the Apostles that the Holy Ghost should guide them into all truth (St. John 16:13); and as He had given commission to them to go into all the world and teach the Gospel He had declared, "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

An example of the practical application of this faith of the Church that it could rely on the guidance of the Holy Spirit is given in the 15th chapter of the Book of the Acts

of the Apostles. A perplexing question arose, highly important for the future of Christianity. A council of the Church was called, and after full discussion and careful consideration a decision was reached; and in setting this forth in the form of a letter the council declared, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." They felt that the corporate mind of the Church in such a matter expressed the mind of God. And as such the decision was accepted by the Church at large. This same procedure, in the same faith, was followed in the great General Councils, seven in all, in which certain points of the faith were explicitly defined. The writer on the Ecumenical Councils in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia says of these, "They form, so to speak, the mental process by which the Christian Church became conscious of the full meaning and proper bearing of its own fundamental doctrines."

Thus far it is largely the teaching function of the Church which has been emphasized. This, to be sure, was one of its chief purposes. The Christian Gospel was on its intellectual side as has been said a divine propaganda, a body of truth which incarnate God made known and commanded His missionaries to teach to the world. Pagans speculated; Christians knew; for God had told them. But our Blessed Lord did more than simply to tell men what was true in belief and right in conduct. He gave them the power to follow His teaching, by means of actual spiritual union with Himself. This was by means of the sacraments. Christ gave command to baptize, for example, as well as to teach.

The Church, then, had two important functions to perform: first to teach the faith, and second to administer the sacraments.

There was in the Apostolic Church a ministry apparently



existing in three grades: first the Apostles, second those called presbyters, and third the deacons. Men were commissioned to these offices with the laying on of hands.

As the years passed and Christianity spread, the continuous identity of the Church which Christ founded through His Apostles remained perfectly clear. But just as in the days of the Apostles there were those who departed from the faith and fellowship of the Church, so it was later. In the second, third, and fourth centuries various sects or denominations arose, Gnostics, Montanists, Manicheans, Donatists, Arians — a host of them — differing from the Church on various matters and at variance among themselves. Some of these bodies were short-lived, others continued to exist for many years, but all finally dwindled and died.

It is not necessary to discuss the sincerity or the intelligence of the founders and members of these religious organizations. The plain fact is that such organizations were not the Church which Christ founded and commissioned, and where they differed from the faith taught by this divinely founded and guided Church they were wrong.

The Christian writers of the early centuries were perfectly clear about this. St. Clement in the first century and St. Ignatius in the early part of the second urge the necessity of unity with the Apostolic Church. St. Irenaeus in the early part of the second century, calling attention to the continuity and unanimity of the teaching of the Church and the diversity of heretical beliefs, speaks of "our faith" as having been received from the Church, and adds, "For this gift of God has been intrusted to the Church as breath was to the first created man for this purpose, that all the members receiving it may be vivified, and the means of communion with Christ has been distributed throughout it,

that is the Holy Spirit, the earnest of incorruption, the means of confirming our faith and the ladder of ascent to God. For in the Church,' it is said, 'God hath set some apostles, prophets, teachers,' and all the other means through which the Spirit works; of which all those are not partakers who do not join themselves to the Church." (Adv. Haeres. iii, 24.) The same author writes, "Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church—those who as I have shown possess the succession from the Apostles; those who together with the succession of the Episcopate have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father; but to hold in suspicion others who depart from the primitive succession and assemble themselves together in any place whatsoever, either as heretics of perverse minds, or as schismatics . . . or again as hypocrites . . . For all these have fallen from the truth." The heretics, he declares, those "who bring strange fire to the altar of God—namely, strange doctrines"—and "those who cleave asunder and separate the unity of the Church," shall receive punishment from God." (Ibid. iv, 26.) St. Cyprian, the great martyr bishop of Carthage, in the middle of the third century draws the same sharp line between the Church and those without, and asks bluntly, "But if the flock is one, how can he be numbered among the flock who is not in the number of the flock? Or how can he be esteemed a pastor who—while the true shepherd remains and presides over the Church by successive ordination—succeeding to no one and beginning from himself becomes a stranger and a profane person, an enemy of the Lord's peace and of the divine unity, not dwelling in the house of God, that is in the Church of God." (Epistle lxxv. *To Magnus*.)

Many other passages in the writings of the Fathers show

that the situation was perfectly clear to them. Christ had founded one Church, the identity of which was perfectly plain. Denominations separate from that Church carried with them by that very fact their own condemnation. St. Irenaeus (Adv. Haeres. iii, 4) states the case exactly. Previous to Valentinus there were no Valentinians; the sect and the doctrines of the Marcionites originated with Marcion. The Gnostics owed their origin to one human founder, the Marcosians to another. The doctrines of these denominations are human opinion. The Church, on the other hand, was founded by Christ through His Apostles, and its teaching is divine truth. "How can anyone be following Christ rightly," these early Fathers asked, "if he is in separation from the Church which Christ founded?"

Now it was to designate the Church which Christ established as distinguished from these various sects of later origin and different belief that the word *Catholic* was used in the Creed and elsewhere. One sometimes hears the statement that the word in the Creed is meant to include all Christian denominations; but that is to take it in a sense exactly opposite to its intended one. The purpose of it in the Creed, so far from being broadly inclusive, was definitely exclusive, distinguishing the Church which Christ founded from all other religious bodies. A quotation from St. Cyril of Jerusalem (A. D. 347) makes this perfectly clear. "And if ever thou art sojourning in any city inquire not simply where the Lord's house is—for the sects of the profane also attempt to call their own dens houses of the Lord—nor merely where the Church is, but where is the Catholic Church. For that is the peculiar name of the holy body the mother of us all." And St. Irenaeus points to the fact that whereas the various heretical and schismatic bodies differ widely in their teachings, "the Catholic



Church possesses one and the same faith throughout the whole world." (Op. cit. i. 10.)

So the Catholic Church—that organized fellowship founded by Christ through His Apostles—continued in existence down through the centuries, administering the sacraments and teaching the divinely revealed Faith. Denominations setting forth the ideas of human founders arose, lasted for a time, and finally perished, but there was no doubt which body it was that alone maintained historic continuity with the Apostolic Church. Such was the situation, for example, in the year 500 A. D.

It may be well at this point to take note of the two highly important matters of the faith and the ministry of the Church.

(A) The Faith of the Church. In the fifth century, for example, the abundance of extant documentary evidence leaves no doubt what the religion of the historic Church was. It was certainly Catholicism as distinguished from Protestantism; not distinctively Roman, to be sure, but a Catholicism such as is held in common by the Roman and Greek Churches today.

This brings us face to face with the following question: In the fifth century was the Church which Christ founded and entrusted with the propagation of His Gospel, and to which He promised His continued presence and the guidance of the Holy Spirit—was that Church teaching the Christian religion as He intended or not? For the writer only one answer can be possible so long as he believes Christ to be God incarnate. Individual teachers there were from time to time who were in various points mistaken, and some local peculiarities here and there; but as for the Church as a whole, that which it unanimously agreed in setting forth as the Christian religion, in the fifth century, or the tenth,

or the fifteenth, must have been what the Christ Who had brought His Gospel for the tenth century as well as the first intended should be taught,—unless we can believe that the promises of incarnate God were unfulfilled, and His purposes were thwarted, and the Holy Spirit failed to guide the Church.

The entire system of the Faith—all the implications and the deductions which necessarily followed from its primary truths—was not formulated at once. Such formulation, the work of the whole Church, was a slow process, extending over many centuries, and was in fact brought about only as the result of question and attack. The Church has never been eager to put forth definitions, but when the faith has been assailed and vital doctrines have been challenged the Church has had to define. Such definition does not add to the original faith; it simply re-asserts the original faith exactly and unmistakably by defining its terms and showing its necessary implications.

A fairly good analogy is seen in the action of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court does not enact laws; it cannot add anything to the United States Constitution; but it is given the absolute and final power of interpretation. It defines a clause of the Constitution or a law (never on its own initiative, nor until the meaning is questioned and the case brought before the Court), and such definition is in no sense an addition to Constitution or law, nor does it give them any new meaning. It merely states explicitly the meaning which is involved in their phraseology and which therefore they have always had. So it is with the Church and the definitions and formulations of dogma which from time to time it has put forth. To be sure, the Church's function is far broader than this merely interpretative and didactic one, but in

this sphere alone the parallel is fairly good; only that the Church's office in this matter is of divine commission and is divinely guided.

The Church as thus referred to means of course the Church which Christ founded—i. e., the Catholic Church—not sects originated by human founders, such as the Marcionites, or Valentinians, or Gnostics, or Donatists, or Waldenses, or modern denominations; and moreover it means the whole Church, for it was of course the whole Church to which Christ gave His commission and His promises, and obviously only the whole Church acting unitedly, or a part only when in agreement with the whole, could rightly claim to be acting by Christ's authority and by divine guidance.

It is important to note also the *sphere* of the Church's infallibility as teacher. God the Son did not come into the world to satisfy mere curiosity or to relieve men from the duty of study. He came to reveal truths about God and man and their relations sufficient for man's assurance and comfort and guidance. And this was the teaching sphere of the Church which He left to carry on His work. The Church was not given commission or promised guidance to teach natural science or archæology. It was commissioned and divinely guided in teaching the Christian religion. If the Church attempted to answer questions outside its province it might expect to blunder; and if men went to the Church (or to the Bible) with such questions they deserved no better answer than in many cases they got. One does not go to a chemist's laboratory to settle the interpretation of a clause of the Constitution, nor to the Supreme Court to learn how to grind lenses. So in setting forth the Christian religion the Church is a sure guide. On other subjects her spokesmen voice merely fallible human opinion.



One method by which the Church reached its decisions in questions of the faith and expressed its mind was by means of the General Councils, to which reference has already been made. These were representative assemblies of the whole Church which after due consideration and discussion drew up decrees that were accepted throughout the Church. Such, for example, was the First Council of Nicea, which condemned the Arian heresy.

Sometimes, however, decisions were reached not through the formal action of a council but as the crystallization of the general belief throughout the Church. Perhaps we might call it the Church's spiritual intuition. Among the matters thus determined was the question of just what books among the various Christian writings should be considered as inspired and so be included in the New Testament. Some of the early denominations differed considerably from the Catholic Church on this subject. (So incidentally one who denies the authority of the historic Church has lost his New Testament as such, for it was the Church which authenticated this and gave it to us.)

One word as to the relation of the Church and Holy Scripture. It was the Church which at Christ's command and with His authorization was made the official teacher of His Gospel to the world. It has been maintained by some that the Bible is the sole teacher—that people were expected to learn the Christian religion at first hand from the New Testament. But surely that is a great misapprehension, and there is nothing in the New Testament itself to support this view. It was a living Church, not a Book, which was to be the teacher. As a matter of fact men embraced Christianity, lived for years and died before a single line of the New Testament was written, and the last of its books was not written till the close of the first cen-

tury. And the various books were not collected to form one New Testament till many years later.

Moreover, not a single one of the books of the New Testament was written as a systematic presentation of the Christian religion to those who had not already been instructed in the Faith. It would be interesting if we had such an Apostolic compendium of the Christian Faith, but we have not. Every book in the New Testament was written to be read by *Christians*. The epistles give exhortations and take up practical problems for those who are already Christians, and St. Luke says he writes his gospel "that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou *hast been instructed*." (St. Luke 1:4.) The idea of having people try to learn the Christian religion by being given books of the New Testament to read and permitted to draw their own inferences — a method which Protestantism has widely advocated — would certainly not have commended itself to the Apostles or to the early Church in general as practical, or reasonable. The New Testament authors never intended their writings for any such purpose as that. "Understandest thou what thou readest?" asked St. Philip of the Ethiopian who was poring over the Old Testament, and the natural answer was, "How can I except some man should guide me?" Precisely. "Go ye into all the world . . . *teaching* them." The Church to teach, the Bible to confirm and illustrate. The New Testament is the Church's Book, written for the Church's own people who are assumed to have been already taught the Christian faith and practice.

There is no command, for example, in the New Testament to observe Sunday, the first day of the week. Why should there be? Christians had been universally observing this weekly memorial of the Resurrection-Day for over

twenty years before the first of the Epistles was written. And the Church had been baptizing for years before our Lord's command to do so was recorded in a written Gospel.

A Christian in the first century learned the doctrines of his religion not from the New Testament but from the teaching of the Church; and this is the normal method. "Therefore, brethren," writes St. Paul, "stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught whether by word or our epistle" (II Thess. 2:15), and his first epistle—which was probably the first book of the New Testament to be written—addresses them as those who were already "followers of the Lord," and "examples to all that believe." The practice of taking New Testament writings and interpreting them for oneself independently of the teaching of the Church is strongly condemned in the second Epistle of St. Peter (3:16), where the author instances those who do this with St. Paul's epistles. The Church was the constituted teacher of the Christian religion, and the interpreter of its own documents, the New Testament writings, and the idea of going direct to the Scriptures and interpreting texts in a sense which ignores or opposes the teaching of the Catholic Church is an inversion of the appointed method.

(B) Ministry, or Hierarchy. We have spoken of the faith of the Church. It is necessary now to take some account of its organization, which forms a bond and test of vital unity.

Owing to the absence of conclusive historical proof in extant documents the ministry in the early Church has been a subject of controversy, and into this field it is not proposed to enter. But at any rate, as soon as we reach a time when the extant evidence is full and unmistakable we find a ministry such as has been continued in the Catholic



Church ever since, with the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons.

The central idea of the ministry of the Catholic Church is that of the possession by the clergy (not as individuals but in their official capacity) of *power* and *authority* delegated by an uninterrupted chain of transmissions from Christ Himself. The power referred to means pre-eminently the power to act as Christ's agents in administering sacraments. Of these latter it must suffice here to say that they are regarded not as merely emblems or reminders, but as means whereby divine grace is actually conveyed, the vital importance of them consisting not in the word and action of the priest, but in something which God Himself does through His appointed agent. It is this divine act, not the outward means of it, that is the vital thing; just as in making a deed to a piece of land the important thing is not the writing of certain words on paper, but the conveyance of property, although it is by means of the former that the latter takes place, and the notary must be duly commissioned or there is no transfer. So the important thing about Confirmation, for example, is not the performance of a certain rite, the laying on of the Bishop's hands to represent something or others, but that through the laying on of the bishop's hands the Holy Spirit is given (Acts 8:17-18.)

It was said that the official power of the clergy is received by transmission. The agent of this transmission (ordination) is a bishop, for only a bishop has received the power to effect it. Thus ordination in the Catholic Church is not merely the setting apart of a man for a religious function; it is essentially *the transmission of power*. Of course, all such transmitted power to act as Christ's agent could not be given originally by men, but has come down

from Christ Himself, being given first of all to the Apostles to whom He said, "As My Father hath sent Me even so send I you." The bishop can transmit only what he has received the power to transmit.

An illustration will perhaps make clear the matter of the delegated power held by the clergy. In the commercial world a man may by legal process make me his agent for certain purposes, by virtue of which authorization my acts *in that sphere* are his. I may be penniless, yet may make a fifty-thousand dollar purchase—for him. He does it through me. (In other spheres, e. g., in social life, my acts are not his at all.) So the clergy of the Catholic Church have received authorization to perform certain acts for Christ—in His Name. It is He, then, Who performs these acts through the human agent, who is only the instrument. The wire does not generate the electric current, it only transmits it. When the priest says "I absolve thee," it is Christ Who speaks the words by the priest's lips. Our Lord left an order of commissioned and fully empowered agents in the world, an order of course to be perpetual, for He said, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." He authorized and empowered the Apostles and they in turn transmitted to others the powers they had received (including that of further transmission). Ordination was effected with the laying on of hands. St. Paul writes to Timothy, "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." (II Tim. 1:6.)

We may believe (a) that the orders of bishop and priest were distinct in Apostolic times as later; or (b) that they were differentiated later on. Each of these views has its advocates; but practically it matters little. (a) The former would mean that the Apostles transmitted to some men, as bishops, all the powers which they themselves had re-

ceived, including that of further transmission (i. e., of ordaining); and to others as presbyters all the powers except that of ordaining. (b) If we accept the theory that the offices of bishop and priest were differentiated later it simply means that the Apostles handed on to those called in the New Testament, *presbyteroi*, or *episcopoi*, all the powers which they themselves held, including that of ordaining; that is, that these *presbyteroi* or *episcopoi*—all the ordinary parish clergy—were given the full powers of bishops; but that after a while the power of *transmitting* Holy Orders was passed on only to certain ones now alone called *episcopoi* or bishops, who were distinguished by this possession of the power to ordain and by certain administrative authority and jurisdiction from the second grade called presbyters or priests. “For what does a bishop do, *ordination excepted*, which a presbyter may not do?” writes St. Jerome in the fifth century.

But at any rate an official possessed only such powers as he had received, and in the fifth century, for example (to take a period late enough to be beyond all dispute), we know that no one had received the power to ordain except the bishops. So that by whomsoever we regard the power of ordination as having been held and transmitted in the earliest times, whether by a separate order of bishops alone or not, it is evident that by the fifth century no one could transmit Holy Orders except a bishop, for no others had received the power to transmit them. That is, after this, at any rate, no one could receive the power to act for Christ in the administration of sacraments (which constitutes essentially the power of priesthood) except by being ordained by an official called a bishop.

(TO BE CONTINUED)



# The Reformed Episcopal Church

BY THE REV. ARTHUR WHIPPLE JENKS, D.D.

**N**EARLY half a century has passed since, in the hall of the Young Men's Christian Association building at the corner of Fourth avenue and Twenty-third street, New York City, the Reformed Episcopal Church was founded, by the statement of the president of an assembly gathered for that purpose, as follows: "By the unanimous votes of ministers and laymen present, I now declare that on this second day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, we have organized ourselves into a Church, to be known by the style and title of *The Reformed Episcopal Church*, conformable with the Declaration of Principles adopted this day, and with the Right Rev. George David Cummins, D.D., as our Presiding Bishop."

The fact that there is such a religious body is known to many people, but the circumstances leading to its formation and the details of its distinctive position are not widely known or have become dimmed in the recollection of those who once were familiar with that chapter of the history of the Church in the United States. That history contains much that is significant and interesting at the present time.

The outstanding figure in all that leads up to the schism from the Episcopal Church in the United States, the only schism that has occurred, is Bishop Cummins. In order to understand the train of events which caused him to withdraw from the Communion in which he held the official position of Bishop we need to know something of his life preceding the radical step taken in 1873.

The founder of the Reformed Episcopal Church, George David Cummins, was born of a father and mother who

were "Episcopalians." In college he had been led at a revival to ally himself with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and, when only twenty years old, had become a licensed preacher in that body. Although never ordained to the full Methodist ministry, he officiated and preached for nearly two years and at once made a reputation as a speaker of marked ability. While attached to certain sides of the work among the Methodists he became dissatisfied with the itinerant system and long before the period of probation was up he was contemplating a change to the Protestant Episcopal Church. The two motives working in his mind, as stated by his wife in her biography of her husband, were, love for a settled home and a high admiration for the Prayer-book Liturgy. No other reasons for entering the ministry of the Church are alluded to in his letters, and he appears not to have grasped the underlying differences between the Episcopal Church and the Methodists. He throws some sidelight upon his change in a letter where he tells a friend: "I thought at first I would be obliged to enter a Theological Seminary, but from a friend, a very distinguished minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, I learn that this will not be necessary. I shall only have to be a candidate and read with a Bishop for six months, and then I can be ordained deacon. One thing I have decided on, and that is that I shall not apply to Bishop Whittingham. I do not like his sentiments. I think Bishop Lee, of Delaware, will be my choice." Again he writes: "I am to be confirmed because it is necessary in order that I may enter the Episcopal Church and be ordained . . . The society in the church is very pleasant. . . . I am becoming more and more attached to the Episcopal Church and love its Liturgy. I was confirmed last Sunday and was much interested in the rite. In about five

months I shall be ordained." In the light of subsequent events these remarks are significant. Here was a case of a young man "railroaded" through confirmation and examinations into Holy Orders without ever having been thoroughly trained in the fundamentals of Church History and doctrinal principles, and having unintelligent prejudices, in certain directions, which were to be important factors in altering his course later on.

Then came the brilliant career which carried the young pulpit orator rapidly from one parish to another, each larger and more influential than the predecessor—a veritable meteoric flight, from Norfolk, Va., to Richmond, then on to Washington and Chicago, declining by the way calls to Baltimore and St. Thomas's, New York, culminating in the election to be Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Kentucky, in 1866. The Bishop of Kentucky at that time, Rt. Rev. B. B. Smith, D.D., a few years later became the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church. Dr. Cummins was consecrated Bishop on November 15, 1866, by the Presiding Bishop, Dr. Hopkins, Bishop of Vermont, assisted by six other bishops, at Louisville, Kentucky. A local newspaper reported that "the Episcopal Oath was taken in a firm, clear, and manly tone, audible in every part of the church." The beginning of his episcopal career was thus in no way premonitory of the later unfortunate course.

For the purpose before us there is no need to dwell upon the pastoral side of Bishop Cummins' episcopate. It was characterized by no unusual features. The declining strength of the Bishop of the diocese gradually threw the entire burden of visitations upon his assistant; and the reputation of the latter as a preacher of great eloquence kept him continually prominent in the ecclesiastical world, gradually perhaps turning his head, as his career, from the



beginning marked with an upward trend of success, continued to keep him a popular idol.

The "little rift within the lute" made its appearance soon after Bishop Cummins had attended for the first time a meeting of the House of Bishops. In a letter written at that date he speaks of the bishop-elect of Oregon as "utterly opposed to the school of ritualists and Romanizers." In his earlier career he had adhered to the so-called evangelical school, but without any pronounced partisanship. As the popular and successful rector of city parishes he came in contact with individuals of the Catholic school so little as to call forth no more than a certain supercilious toleration. But in the sphere of the Bishop's work he could not avoid closer relations and apparently was insufficiently grounded in a thorough knowledge of the Church and its dogmatic and liturgical history to understand the rationale of "advanced" churchmanship. Moreover, the marked increase of strength on the part of those who sympathized with the Oxford Movement in England and the great ability of such leaders as Dr. Ewer and Dr. Dix became a source of irritation to him. A little group of Bishops to which Cummins belonged, which included Bishop McIlvaine, who at the General Convention in New York in 1868 objected to the surpliced choir of boys at the daily service at Trinity Chapel, was beginning to make persistent attacks upon all ceremonial developments. In his visitations also, he apparently came in contact with a type of churchmanship with which he did not sympathize, but it was too strong to be attacked. Nevertheless his position was still one of general loyalty. He writes disapprovingly of the memorial of certain of the low churchmen, asking for permission to use alternate forms in some of the offices in the Prayer Book; and declares that "all that we can do is to plant ourselves

upon the Prayer Book as it is, for thus we can save any movement *Romeward* or *Greekward* by any changes in our Prayer Book." On the other hand he had called forth considerable criticism by allying himself with certain evangelical societies outside the Church and had asserted that he would maintain that relationship and that he acted "from an urgent necessity laid upon me to give all my influence in favor of the Protestant element in our Church, and to resist the mighty tide of error in our midst tending towards Rome." He gave an address before one of these societies in reply to Dr. Ewer's three sermons entitled, "Protestantism a Failure." The tide was beginning to set definitely in a certain direction.

Three series of events in Bishop Cummin's experience brought about the crisis which resulted in the separation from his communion and official status, and the foundation of a new body. The first was due to his connection with certain societies among the Protestant religious bodies with which he was associated. Invited to preach before an assembly gathered in Chicago to establish a society "For the Promotion of Evangelical Religion in the North-West," he was requested by the Bishop of Chicago, Dr. Whitehouse, not to give such an assembly the sanction of his presence, because Bishop Whitehouse regarded the movement as "designed to disturb the diocese and factious in its character." A protracted correspondence caused Bishop Cummins to take up a belligerent attitude towards the definite churchmanship of the day which could not acknowledge that the Protestant bodies were not essentially different from the Anglican Communion. No doubt his pride was a little hurt by the action of the Bishop of Chicago, and his admirers aided him in closing his eyes to the situation from the point of view of the diocesan. He did go to Chi-

cago and carry out his intention in a modified form, but the hobnobbing with various denominations from that time on became one of his habitual poses. At the same time his antagonism to anything like positive and complete churchmanship and to the use of ceremonial in worship became more and more bitter.

The second series of events which profoundly affected Bishop Cummins was connected with the trial and deposition of the Rev. Charles E. Cheney, a priest of the diocese of Chicago, in 1871, for refusing to use the terms "regeneration" and "regenerate" in the baptismal offices on the ground that he could not admit that baptism carried with it a change of spiritual state in the baptized. This controversy on the subject of baptismal regeneration had been a disturbing subject for some years, affecting a considerable number of the clergy. The House of Bishops in 1871 had issued a Declaration, couched in language probably intentionally ambiguous, which had somewhat quieted conscientious objectors, but Mr. Cheney took an open stand on the issue, and, after trial before an ecclesiastical court, was suspended until he would consent to use the Baptismal office intact as in the Prayer Book. On obstinately maintaining his attitude of disobedience he was deposed. Bishop Cummins fully sympathized with Mr. Cheney's doctrinal position and considered him to have been unjustly sentenced. But in the course of the controversy there had been brought forward as witness to the position taken in the early days of the Church in the United States the tentative Prayer Book prepared in 1785 by Dr. William White, afterwards Bishop of Pennsylvania. This book had omitted in its baptismal offices the terms "regeneration" and "regenerate." The proposed book, as every liturgical student knows, had not been



received with favor at the time and even Bishop White himself was not ardent in advocating its adoption. The book was however seized upon by Bishop Cummins when it was brought to his attention, and its use as a liturgy pure and free from tendency to Romish error became a kind of obsession with him. The more he came in contact with the strong, constructive, historical theology of the catholic-minded bishops and other clergy, the more he became convinced that the Prayer Book really was overwhelmingly on their side, and hence that there must be radical alterations in the Prayer Book if teaching and practices which he disliked were to be put down. This instance and others of a similar character are strong testimony from unwilling witnesses that the Book of Common Prayer, as it stood even in the seventies, is a formulary which contains and countenances, even if it does not explicitly prescribe, all the essential doctrines of the Catholic Faith.

Bishop Cummins had, in the few years of his early episcopate, become more and more a party man in Church matters. He was looked upon with suspicion by many; and a few feared that he would take some extreme position, of which certain premonitory hints had been given, which the majority even of his friends would deprecate. When, owing to failing health, the Bishop, Rt. Rev. B. B. Smith,—who had become the Presiding Bishop,—obtained permission to reside outside the diocese, that permission was granted only after Bishop Smith had consented to retain all authority in the diocese himself, leaving his assistant no disciplinary power whatever. Bishop Cummins had met on at least two occasions a number of disaffected clergy and laity who advocated some drastic action such as the formation of a new organization, in separation from the Church. Now only some distinct crisis was needed to precipitate such a move.

That crisis came in connection with a meeting of an international movement known as the Evangelical Alliance, which had for its object the promoting of interdenominationalism in the direction of setting aside barriers of creed and polity and bringing about a superficial kind of Church union. It was looked on askance by the majority of staunch Churchmen, but was ardently championed by those whose grasp of essential Church principles was loose and unbalanced. Bishop Cummins had been invited to be one of the speakers at the public meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York. On his way to that city he visited for a few days at different points where he had friends and sympathizers, Syracuse, Providence, and Hoosac, N. Y. At the last mentioned place (we have it on the personal authority of the family with whom Bishop Cummins stayed) the final measures for the formation of a new religious organization were decided upon. Bishop Cummins preached at Hoosac in the beautiful little church, now the Chapel of Hoosac School for Boys. The Reformed Episcopalians but recently failed in an attempt to get possession of this building, All Saints' Church, on the ground that the building had been bequeathed to them.

From Hoosac Bishop Cummins went directly to New York, where he was the guest of the Rev. Stephen Tyng, Jr., who had been tried and admonished in 1867 for preaching in a Methodist place of worship at New Brunswick, N. J.

On Sunday, October 12, 1873, Bishop Cummins took part in the joint communion service held in the Presbyterian church of which Dr. John Hall was the pastor. There were also present on that occasion an eminent Scottish Presbyterian divine and Professor Dorner, of Berlin, the author of the work, "The History of the Doctrine of the Person

of Christ." Bishop Cummins in his letter to a correspondent who criticized his action, says, "On last Sunday afternoon I sat at the table of the Lord in the church of the Rev. John Hall, and partook of the Lord's Supper with him and the Rev. Dr. Arnot, of Edinburgh, and administered the cup to the elders of Dr. Hall's church . . . There is nothing in the 'ecclesiastical order' or 'discipline' of the Church of England, or of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, forbidding such an act of inter-communion among Christian people who are one in faith and love, one in Christ their great Head. The Church of England does not deny the validity of the orders of the ministers of non-Episcopal churches."

This action on the part of Bishop Cummins was no doubt meant to be of the nature of a challenge to see how far he would have the sympathy of his fellow Churchmen and brother Bishops. Of course, strictures upon his conduct both in itself and as the attitude taken by a high official were many and outspoken. Perhaps Bishop Cummins himself was somewhat taken aback by the strength of the feeling against his disloyal behavior. Carried away by the popularity and adulation which had been his for so long a time, he might not unnaturally have expected more supporters to rally to him. The comment of his wife in her chapter on the episode probably comes very near the truth, in stating that "he felt deeply that his position in the Protestant Episcopal Church was indeed changed. While he had for many years felt intensely the inroads made by the Ritualists into the Church of his love, and while he had earnestly and to the utmost of his powers combated those errors, and although the necessity of forming a new and thoroughly Evangelical Episcopal Church had been frequently discussed, yet to the very last moment Bishop



Cummins clung with ardent affection to the Protestant Episcopal Church, hoping and praying each day that God would send him and others like-minded deliverance within the Church, by allowing them the free use of alternate phrases in the Prayer Book, whereby they could without scruple of conscience minister in her fold."

Here indeed we have the very crux of the situation. The Book of Common Prayer was catholic, not evangelical, according to the Bishop and his sympathizers. If he could not succeed in getting alterations emptying the formularies of their doctrinal meaning, nor even secure the permissive use of other language, then he could not remain longer in the communion which required allegiance to the Prayer Book on the part of bishops and priests. The consistency of this position is evident. It necessitated the next successive steps which were taken fearlessly and with straightforwardness, regrettable but nevertheless admirable, as the acts of a man coming out in the open, not taking refuge in subterfuge, speciousness, or questionable pretexts.

Without waiting for any official action on the part of the authorities of the Church, Bishop Cummins, in November of 1873, announced to Bishop Smith, who was both his own diocesan superior and also Presiding Bishop, his intention of withdrawing immediately from the Church, because of his profound dissatisfaction with the doctrines on the sacraments and ministry contained in the Prayer Book and because of his disapproval of "the services as customary in ritualistic churches." He declares, "the only true remedy, in my judgment, is the judicious yet thorough revision of the Prayer Book, eliminating from it all that gives countenance, directly or indirectly, to the whole system of Sacerdotalism and Ritualism."

Three days later Bishop Cummins issued a circular calling for a meeting "to organize an Episcopal Church on the

basis of the Prayer Book of 1785: a basis broad enough to embrace all who hold 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' as that faith is maintained by the Reformed Churches of Christendom; with no exclusive and unchurching dogmas toward Christian brethren who differ from them in their views of polity and church order."

The invitation did not meet with the general approval of those who in general sympathized with the views of Bishop Cummins. They deprecated his proposed action. But indeed it was he who was consistent and they who dared not face the inevitable result of their avowed attitude. Two courses only appeared open: to remain and retract their opposition and disloyalty, or to go out from a body which had not changed but with which they, in their changed position, were no longer in accord. Bishop Cummins commands respect for his declining to flinch from the inevitable action of an honest opposition.

Accordingly, on December 2, 1873, the meeting for which a call had been issued was held and after certain preliminaries and a report from a committee on organization, the declaration quoted at the beginning of this sketch was solemnly made and the Reformed Episcopal Church founded. The act was a public one, a considerable number of people having come to witness the procedure, including reporters representing the religious and secular papers and a group of students from the General Theological Seminary, the latter thus witnessing an interesting and significant piece of Church History in the making.

The name by which the new organization has been ever since known was adopted at the meeting,—The Reformed Episcopal Church. The Right Rev. George David Cummins, D.D., was accepted as its Presiding Bishop and the following Declaration of Principles adopted:

I. The Reformed Episcopal Church, holding "the faith once delivered unto the saints," declares its belief in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God, and the sole Rule of Faith and practice; in the Creed "commonly called the Apostles' Creed"; in the Divine institution of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and in the doctrines of grace substantially as they are set forth in the thirty-nine articles of religion.

II. This Church recognizes and adheres to Episcopacy, not as of divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of church polity.

III. This Church, retaining a Liturgy which shall not be imperative or repressive of freedom in prayer, accepts the Book of Common Prayer, as it was revised, proposed and recommended for use by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, A. D. 1785, reserving full liberty to alter, abridge, enlarge, and amend the same, as may seem most conducive to the edification of the people, "provided that the substance of the faith be kept entire."

IV. This Church condemns and rejects the following erroneous and strange doctrines as contrary to God's Word: first, that the Church of Christ exists only in one order or form of ecclesiastical polity; second, that Christian ministers are "priests" in another sense than that in which all believers are "a royal priesthood"; third, that the Lord's Table is an altar on which the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father; fourth, that the Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is a presence in the elements of Bread and Wine; fifth, that Regeneration is inseparably connected with Baptism.



The reasons given for adopting the Prayer Book of 1785 are, that the word "priest" does not appear in the book and there is no countenance of sacerdotalism; that the offices for Baptism, Confirmation, and the Communion, contain no sanction of the errors of Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence in the elements in the Communion, nor of a sacrifice offered by a priest in that sacrament.

In spite of this defiant act of founding a schismatical organization, Bishop Cummins was given six months in which to withdraw his declaration that he had abandoned the ministry of the Episcopal Church. He was presented for trial and on December 12 all episcopal authority as Assistant Bishop of Kentucky was withdrawn from him. Meanwhile Bishop Cummins was on his way to Chicago to consecrate to the episcopate Dr. Cheney, previously deposed by the Bishop of Chicago. Just before reaching the city he received a telegram from the Presiding Bishop officially withdrawing from him all authority to act as Bishop. In spite of these actions the service of consecration took place, no other Bishop, of course, taking part, but several clergy assisting in the laying on of hands.

At first the new organization spread with some rapidity in the Middle West and in Canada; but its main strength lay in Philadelphia, Chicago, and New York. Gradually the impetus was checked and since its early years it has not flourished. Bishop Cummins was tried and deposed in due form by the Episcopal Church and died two years later. The number of Bishops has always been small. According to the statistics of 1918 the number of Bishops in the United States is three, in Canada one. There are 75 organizations in the United States and Canada, 11,050 members, and 88 clergy,—an increase over the statistics of a decade ago. This indicates what is not surprising, that a considerable

number of people wish for a liturgical service and a mild ceremonial and an episcopal organization without any definite sacramental teaching or worship or other authoritative features, rejecting the supernatural in the Church's life and constitution. The Reformed Episcopal Church seems well adapted to such positions in religion.

Some of the significant and interesting peculiarities of the Prayer Book of the Reformed Episcopal Church, as it exists at present, are noted as follows. The title "priest" does not appear in the book, "minister" or "presbyter" being substituted. A note inserted after the Nicene Creed explains that by the phrase, "One Catholic and Apostolic Church" is signified "The blessed company of all faithful people"; and by "One Baptism for the remission of sins" "the Baptism of the Holy Ghost." In the Communion Office, after the sermon it is required that the minister shall give the following or a similar invitation: "Our fellow Christians of other branches of Christ's Church, and all who love our Divine Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in sincerity, are affectionately invited to the Lord's Table." The Prayer of Consecration ends with the recital of the Words of Institution. A note at the end of the Communion Office declares: "The act and prayer of consecration do not change the nature of the elements, but merely set them apart for a holy use; and the reception of them in a kneeling posture is not an act of adoration of the elements." The Kalendar recognizes no Saints' Days. In the Baptismal offices the terms "regenerate" and "regeneration" find no place, the significant substitution in one portion being: "We yield thee humble thanks, O Heavenly Father, that thou hast inclined us to *dedicate* this child to thee in baptism." In the rite of Confirmation there is no mention of the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying-on-of-hands, but

the act is spoken of simply as the confirming of the Baptismal Covenant. A note is added to the effect that "Members of other Churches, uniting with this Church, need not be confirmed, except at their own request." It is also stated that, "The administration of the order of Confirmation is confined to the Bishops, not as of any Divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of Church usage." In the ordination of presbyters and the consecration of Bishops there is no mention of the gift of the Holy Ghost through the laying-on-of-hands. In the latter office presbyters join with the Bishop at the laying-on-of-hands, "with such other Bishops as may be present," thus allowing a single Consecrator. An office is provided for the Public Reception of Presbyters from other denominations. The Presbyter is presented to the Bishop as a "godly and well-learned Presbyter" and the Bishop addresses him as follows: "Reverend Brother, it has been duly certified to us that you have been ordained to the Holy Ministry in the ——— Church, and now desire to exercise your Ministry in this Church; do you solemnly declare your belief in the Old and New Testaments, and in the Doctrines set forth in our Articles and Liturgy?" The Bishop gives him the right hand of fellowship, but does not use the laying-on-of-hands.

This brief account of the only schism which has gone out from our Communion in the United States indicates quite definitely the idea of "reform" which characterized Bishop Cummins and his adherents. In a word, the denial of everything supernatural in sacraments, ministry, and worship is the distinctive position. It would seem quite unnecessary to make alterations in our Prayer Book in that direction for the sake of any who wish to take their stand upon such a principle of denial. The Reformed Episcopal Church was founded forty-six years ago expressly for those



who wished a religious home with a liturgical service and non-charismatic officers. The Church of Bishop Cummins and Bishop Cheney may yet have a future before it.

---

## Leo Tolstoy and Christianity

BY CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING, PH.D.

*Lecturer in Slavonic Languages in Columbia University.*

THERE can be little doubt that one of the most fertile and influential religious thinkers of the last century was the Russian philosopher and author, Leo Tolstoy. Perhaps no modern theologian has so appealed to the mind of the Western world; and his mode of life has contributed to the esteem in which his writings have been held. A noble, highly cultured, and sincere man voluntarily giving up his wealth and power to live as a humble peasant, he reminds us in many ways of a mediæval saint or a Christian of the early ages of the Church.

At the same time all would admit that there were some rather unusual aspects to his teaching. His unique position and his great influence abroad saved him from "persecution" by the Holy Synod of Russia and it was only toward the end of his life that he was excommunicated by it. Nevertheless his doctrines differed very widely from the teaching of the historic Church.

The basis of all his religious theories was the Sermon on the Mount. This he interpreted literally and used as a rule of life. The central point of this sermon he found in the five commandments of Christ found in St. Matthew v, 21 ff, and he laid the chief emphasis upon the phrase, "That ye resist not evil" (v. 39). We will pass over the undoubted pacifist position which he was forced to assume, since he

forbade all material and external opposition to evil of any kind; and merely remark that there exists in Russia a pacifist sect of Tolstoyans which refused to participate in the war against Germany and militarism. His application of these texts was at times very naïve. At the end of "Resurrection," one of his latest novels, Nekhlyudov was given a copy of the Gospels by an English missionary, and as he read it, he was immediately convinced that the literal performance of these commandments would solve all the problems of the world without any difficulty.

At the same time, there is a very perceptible feeling of surprise and almost of pride in the author's realization of his achievements in expounding the real meaning of the Gospel. He says: "It was a long time before I could accustom myself to the strange thought that after 1800 years, during which the law of Christ had been preached to millions of people, after thousands of people had consecrated their lives to the study of this law, now I had succeeded in discovering the law of Christ as something new. But strange as this may seem, it was the truth." ("In what is My Faith?") Yet in the essentials of his teaching, Tolstoy gives us only the very obvious comments made by a rather biassed and literal study of part of the Bible.

Tolstoy was a profound admirer of religion. We may well concede that the society of Russia and the life of the intellectual classes had been as here permeated with unbelief in religion and a very real belief in the infallibility of natural science; and we may well be grateful to Tolstoy for emphasizing as he did the significance and importance of religion. In analyzing the attitude which people adopted towards life, he found four systems in common use. Men refused to think of the problems which surrounded them, but this attitude was rendered impossible, when once they

were compelled to consider them. Or they resorted to an Epicurean search for pleasure, but like Epicureanism of every age, this could not give a final solution of life. The third attitude was a defiance of the problems and of the world, but the followers of this course should logically commit suicide, and their failure to do so showed their dissatisfaction with this method. But the great majority of people drifted with the current, following now one goal and now another. Tolstoy rightly saw that the only rational solution of the problems of life lay in religion, which still held its preeminent position in the life of the peasants and the lower classes.

When Tolstoy had gone thus far, it would have been easy for him to have adopted the view of the Christian Church. At one time in his career he affiliated himself with this. So in *Anna Karenina*, Levin became reconciled with the Church, but critics noticed even here the likelihood that the sage and the Church would soon part again.

The definite breach was due fundamentally to the character of Tolstoy's religion, and his opposition to the supernatural in every form. He found that the Church contained more than the Sermon on the Mount and insisted upon belief in certain doctrines. He himself was, so to speak, a religious rationalist and was consequently brought into conflict with the Religion of the Incarnation. He clearly stated the dilemma: "The Sermon on the Mount or the Creed: it is impossible to believe both." Or again: "People who believe in a wicked and foolish God Who cursed the human race and doomed His Son to be a sacrifice and destined part of humanity to eternal punishment, cannot believe in a God of love. A man who believes in the God Christ who will come with glory to judge and punish both the living and the dead, cannot believe in a Christ Who bids



us turn the other cheek to our oppressors, not to judge, to forgive and to love our enemies. . . . A man who believes in the salvation of men by faith in an Atonement or in Sacraments cannot bend all his energies to live according to the moral teaching of Christ ("The Kingdom of God Is Within You," iii). His interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount as a prohibition of violence (including government) led him to reject the judgment of God and all organized Christianity; and we may fairly say that he based his religious belief upon the denial of the Church and of Christ as much as upon the Sermon on the Mount. Thus he created an arbitrary and hypothetical contrast in order to attack the Church; and he submitted the dogmas of Orthodoxy to a superficial examination which proved their absurdity. Thus he argued that one God and three Gods could not exist simultaneously, and that, consequently the Trinity was impossible. The same naive reasoning and misunderstanding was applied to all the other doctrines; and finally Tolstoy was able to evolve his views of Christian theology, an explanation remarkable only for its blasphemous character. The Church was reduced to a self-founded institution organized to oppress the people.

Like most reformers, Tolstoy never stopped to consider how we know about Christ. He was greatly impressed by the theory that the Church had corrupted Christianity, and he at once commenced to apply it. Of course, the New Testament would not bear out his views, but that was of no consequence. He published a "Short Exposition of the Gospel" and in the preface he states that he has omitted no part of the teaching of the Gospel. "But the following passages are omitted: the conception and birth of St. John Baptist, his imprisonment and death, the birth of Jesus, his ancestry, the flight with his mother into Egypt, the

miracles of Jesus in Cana and Capernaum, the driving out of devils, the walking on the water, the withering of the fig tree, the healing of the sick, the raising of the dead, the resurrection of Christ Himself, and indication of prophecies fulfilled in the life of Christ. These verses are omitted, because they do not contain any teaching but merely describe events which took place before, during, and after the teaching of Jesus, and so complicate the exposition. However they are to be understood, they do not contradict the teaching nor prove its truth. The only significance of these verses for Christianity was the fact that they served as proofs of the deity of Jesus for unbelievers. For a man who understands the unconvincing character of a story about a miracle, and doubts whether the deity of Jesus is contained in his teaching, these verses drop out of themselves because of their uselessness." St. Paul deserves a very high place in the list of those who had corrupted Christianity, for the writings of the Apostle show that he was not acquainted with the Sermon on the Mount, and consequently he could know little or nothing of Christianity. Besides that, none of the Apostles were infallible. The actual teachings of Christ were the only thing of importance, and these were preserved by the criminal and self-seeking Church but disregarded. Tolstoy never apparently faced the inconsistency of the theories that some portion of the New Testament represents the real words of Christ, and that the same books had been worked over by men who were directly interested in destroying and abrogating that teaching.

Let us consider now the positive beliefs of Tolstoy. First, what did he mean by religion? The answer is: "True religion is that relationship which is fully consonant with the reason and knowledge of a man and which he has es-

tablished with the infinite life which surrounds him and which binds up his life with this infinity and governs his actions" ("What Is Religion" iii). No religion can be real which establishes man's relation to God in a way of which his reason cannot approve.

With this as a basis and remembering that he considered the higher forms of other religions as approximating to Christianity, let us see how he regarded God. To him God was life and love and a man was truly alive only when he was conscious of God. But God is unknowable and "every attempt to imagine that I do know Him (for example, that He is the Creator, or merciful, or anything of the sort), removes me from Him and prevents my approach to Him. . . . I must add that the pronoun 'He' somewhat destroys God for me. 'He' in some way belittles Him." The exact relationship between God and man can be seen from the following: "God is everything unlimited which I find limited in myself: I am a limited body: God, an unlimited body; I am a being which has existed for 63 years: God, a being which has existed eternally; I am a being thinking within the limits of my comprehension: God, a being which thinks without limits; I am a being which loves some things sometimes: God, a being which loves endlessly. I am a part: He is the whole. I cannot understand myself, save as a part of Him" ("Thoughts on God"). Of course this is far removed from the personal God worshipped by the Christian Church. With such a conception of Deity the Trinity is impossible, and in obedience to his reason Tolstoy rejected it as inconsistent with the above ideas.

With the Trinity, the Incarnation disappeared. The idea that Christ could be both God and man was illogical. According to the Christian theories of God, "God is independence, man is dependence, God is Creator, man is cre-



ated, God is good, man is evil." Again the author makes no attempt to understand fully the position of the Church. He has taken certain salient points and striven to present them in an impossible form, and he continues with his attack on the Incarnation by ridiculing the various attempts made throughout the ages to define the position of the Church. He reaches the amazing conclusion that nowhere in the Gospels, or at least in Christ's teaching, did He ever claim to be more than an ordinary man. All references to Christ's relation to God, as in "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father" (St. John 10:15), he interprets as meaning that the Son of Man, i. e., humanity, is in close relations with God. Even the opening of St. John's Gospel has been misinterpreted, for the Word cannot refer to Christ, and he considers v. 18, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him," a sure proof that Christ is *not* God, for "if the only begotten Son declared God, Whom no one can ever see, it is obvious that this Son is not God." There is no need to continue quoting examples of this method of interpretation. It is obviously an attempt to disprove the claims of the Church. The Atonement fares no better, because the idea that the sacrifice of the Son of God on Calvary could take away the sins of the world is unreasonable. Further, it is false, because every one knows that sin has not been abolished and that human life has gone on as before. He flatly denies the Resurrection, and in each case when he makes an outline of the Gospel story, he ends with the last words of Christ on the Cross and with His death. In a word, he repudiates all the doctrines concerning themselves with Christ and asserts plainly that He was not God and never claimed to be.

As far as the Holy Ghost is concerned, we have again a denial of Personality, of His influence on the Church and the Bible, and Tolstoy asserts that the story of the descent of the Holy Ghost as found in the Book of Acts was inspired by the necessity of finding supernatural sanction for the Council of Jerusalem.

The Church stripped of Her Divine Founder is regarded merely as a self-created hierarchy desirous of obtaining power by violence, and lacking since the time of Constantine even the desire to carry out the teachings of Christ.

Not content with thus dismantling the entire structure of Christian theology, Tolstoy set himself to rewrite the teaching of Christ in a way that accorded with his own views. A few examples of this "impartial" method of translation may be given. St. Luke 9:58, "And Jesus said unto him, Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head," becomes in Tolstoy's gospel: "And Jesus said to him: you have no place to go to follow me: I have no house nor place to live. Animals have dens and holes but a man is everywhere at home, if he lives in the spirit."

Christ's rebuke to His apostles after calming the storm, "Why are ye so fearful? How is it that ye have no faith?" (St. Mark 4:40) becomes "Why are ye so timid? Have ye no faith in the life of the spirit?"

St. John 8:58, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am," is explained to mean: "Before Abraham was, there existed the understanding of good, the thing which I am explaining to you."

St. John 12:32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me," means according to the Tolstoyan system, "When the Son of man shall be raised above earthly life, he will unite all in one," and the comment on

vv. 35-6 explains that "to lift up the Son of man means to live by that light of understanding which is in you. To lift up the Son of man above the earth is to believe in the light, while there is light, so as to be the son of understanding."

The object of all these passages is clearly to destroy personality. Tolstoy taught that in heaven there were no personalities. There is no bodily or personal resurrection from the dead. This is the lesson to be drawn from Christ's answer to the Sadducees (St. Matt. 22:23-33). "If there is a living God, that man who has come into communion with the eternally living God is alive," and there are no personal questions possible. Elsewhere, Tolstoy objected to all solutions proposed as to the future. "The heaven and delights of Mohammed are too rough and clearly incompatible with a true understanding of man and God. Similarly the ecclesiastical idea of heaven and hell is inconsistent with the idea of a God of love. The transmigration of souls is less unspiritual but it postulates the individual character of being; the idea of Nirvana lacks all material character but it contradicts the demands of reason—of the rationality of existence" ("Christian Teaching").

Naturally with this desire to abolish personality and the removal from God of all attributes except love, prayer was very vitally affected. The following version of the Lord's Prayer may be cited here: "Our father without beginning and ending like heaven! Let only your being be holy. Let only your power exist, so that your will may be performed without beginning or ending on earth. Give me food for life at present. Remove and wipe out my former mistakes, as I remove and wipe out all the mistakes of my brothers, so that I may not fall into error and may be freed from evil. For thine is the power and the strength and



thine is the decision." In line with this, intercessory and supplicatory prayer is not to be considered necessary, since we are part of God.

The prohibition of the use of "vain repetitions" in prayer (St. Matt. 6:7) is extended to all formal prayers in which we make use of the words of other men, unless our spiritual state corresponds exactly to that in which they were at the time when they first made this prayer. We are therefore not to pray at definite hours of the day but only at those periods when our consciousness of God is so intense that we make progress in our spiritual life. Besides this there should be constant prayer, i. e., remembrance of the presence of God so as to assist us in our struggle against sin.

For a Christian Tolstoy's attitude toward sin is very unsatisfactory. The author cannot admit the Atonement, or the Sacraments. He refuses likewise to permit prayer to God for the strengthening of man in his struggle against sin. The difficulty of the situation is increased by the fact that a man recognizing a certain act as sinful desires to become holy at once, but all great changes as in the material, so in the spiritual world, come by slow development. Therefore a man recognizing the sinfulness of his life should begin gradually to root out these sins by a constant remembrance of God and by constantly avoiding occasions for sin. It goes without saying that the chief sins for a Christian are contained in violations of the Five Commandments set forth in the Sermon on the Mount, and Tolstoy carefully states in which order the sins committed against these are to be fought, while the man continues to indulge in the others but not more seriously until the time for them to be opposed comes.

The goal of all this religion is love,—love for God of

Whom we are a part, and for our neighbors and all mankind, as also parts of God. We should sacrifice as willingly for strangers as for friends, for peoples whom we do not know as for relatives, because all persons whom we are bound to aid according to the rules of the world, as parents, children, friends, etc., we assist not because we love them in God but because they minister to our comfort. In other words, they contribute to the well-being of our transient ego, and in assisting them we are satisfying our lower instincts and not fulfilling the will of God. Love is always in the present, and any call, no matter how unimportant, must never be refused because we expect a serious call in the future. Love can never be postponed.

Of course the Sacraments are unhesitatingly rejected as foolish inventions of the Church, and when Tolstoy explains Christ's teaching on Baptism in the conversation with Nicodemus, he carefully omits all mention of the water of Baptism. Similarly the Holy Eucharist is proved impossible, unless Christ meant that the Apostles were to give their own body and blood to their disciples. In a word, Tolstoy endeavored to see how many blasphemous suggestions he could find in the New Testament, so as to attack the Church.

It seems hardly worth while to add criticisms of similar character on the idolatry of the Church as manifested by the use of ikons and the invocation of saints. They are merely such as we would expect from the manner in which Tolstoy handled Christ Himself. Of course all these "superstitions" are to be cast out root and branch.

The various charges brought against the Church and the Christian system of theology are grouped by Tolstoy under five heads, as follows: The Church has tolerated and preached belief in the supernatural and has taught that

the clergy receive by ordination certain powers and grace from God, when they are well aware that Christ never founded any Church. It has fostered belief in miracles performed by Christ and others as proof of the supernatural claims which it has advanced and thereby has spurned our God-given faculty of reasoning. It has separated man from God by interposing a mediator between God and man and has declared a normal man Christ to be the Son of God and a necessary intercessor between man and God in defiance of the clear words of Christ Himself. The Church, apostles, prophets, saints, etc., are also needless mediators for Christianity and play the same role as the dervishes, Buddhas, and lamas of other religions. It has tolerated and approved external forms, prayers, sacraments, sacrifices, beautiful churches with costly decorations, magnificent music, and many other devices, and has tried to deceive the people into thinking that these things form part of true religion. But the last and most cruel of all these sins is the pernicious influence which the Church has exerted upon the young and the children, for instead of telling them the truth, it has given to them the ideas of people who lived hundreds of years previously and has told them such manifest untruths as that Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity, made the world and came down to earth, to atone with his blood for the sin of Adam, and the older people have not scrupled to fill the young minds of children with these tales which they themselves know to be false, and therein they have done the same wrong that the Jews, Moslems, and Buddhists do, when they explain to their children the distinctive truths of their religions.

Such, in short, are the outlines of the religious system advocated by Tolstoy. He repudiated Orthodox Christianity, he repudiated the Deity of Christ, the Sacraments, the



Church, everything. He was really a confessed pantheist, an avowed admirer of only that portion of Christianity which was in harmony with the ethical systems of other religions. In other words, the content of real religion was to be found by taking the highest common factor of all of the great religious systems of the world, systems ranging from Christianity to Animism. The whole was carried out by a relentless and arbitrary method of Biblical criticism which permitted the excision of any passage which was not considered to be in harmony with his conception of the whole.

Can Christianity profit from the theological writings of Count Tolstoy, as distinguished from his ethical productions, which we have not considered in this paper? It is hard to see what party can respect them. Any believer in the historic Church must reject them instantly because of their blasphemous comments on the Church and the Sacraments. But the Evangelical Christian can no more be content with them. Belief in the Incarnation and the Atonement is criticized as harshly and condemned as strongly as are the doctrines of the Invocation of Saints and of the Apostolic Succession. If we consider the theological aspects of his works, Leo Tolstoy can hardly be called a Christian in the usual sense of that word, since he is hardly more than a religious rationalist. We would probably be hardly unjust in calling him a religious Bolshevik, and whatever views one may hold as to the spiritual or unspiritual character of the former Holy Synod of Russia, no real believer in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as it has been handed down by the overwhelming majority of all Christian bodies, can fail to approve of their final excommunication of this blasphemous critic of the most sacred doctrines of Christianity.

# The Function of the Theological Seminary

BY THE REV. NEIL E. STANLEY.

**W**ANTED, a definition. Why is a Seminary? No one seems precisely to know. It presents one of the definitely strategic situations in the Church. Most of our present clergy came from it. I carefully avoid saying that they were trained by it, because so many of them deny that they were. The Seminary is not a failure, though that is not by any means equivalent to saying that it is a success, for success it emphatically is not.

The truly surprising amount of interest displayed in the recent effort to draft a new Education Canon to be submitted to General Convention was perhaps a symptom. Perhaps too it is symptomatic that it should have manifested itself last summer in open letters to the Church papers—letters not about the Canon at all, but about the Seminaries.

When people write open letters they write them because the open letter is a sort of safety valve for discontent. When the ecclesiastically discontented wrote about the Seminaries they faulted a great many things, but I venture to think that what they were really trying to get at is a condition, the condition, doubtless, that Father Carey had in mind when he referred to the Clergy of the Church of England as the best educated and the poorest trained in Christendom. This is true of us—with a difference. Our Clergy are not quite so well educated as the English, and are a trifle better trained.

In localizing the difficulty the place of the Seminaries is rather obvious. The delinquencies of the Priesthood will inevitably be laid to their charge quite regardless of

whether the imputation is just or not. Frankly, I think that it is just, and that if it is not entirely reasonable it is at least the verdict of a sure instinct, and the Seminary may as well come in for its full share of responsibility since it has undertaken the major portion of the task.

At present the Seminary is in the dark. It has only the haziest possible notion of what it is trying to do. With all the proposals for reform, the adverse criticism, the putting about details, the tinkering with curricula, no one seems to be in the slightest degree aware what the whole thing is about. It is always hard to begin at the beginning, but that is precisely what we shall have to do. First, to find out what is wrong. If it isn't laboring the obvious I should like to drive away at just this point that no one seems to know what we are really in for; that we haven't taken the trouble to begin at the beginning; that we are woefully lacking in definitions. No one, and least of all the Seminary, seems to know just what the Seminary is to do. What sort of product is it to turn out, or is it to turn out any sort of product at all?

It is somewhat irritating after demanding definitions that amount to constitution and by-laws immediately to propose them one's self, but perhaps I may irritate amiably. I am sure of the amiability as long as I can get a text from Father Carey, and so I begin with him. In his phrase "the poorest trained" there is a clue to the answer for the question "Why is a Seminary?" Let me propose, quite dogmatically; it is the function of the Seminary to train Priests. Now the Seminary is simply not aware of this. It debates the question of Greek. I am keen for the retention of Greek, but think it simply irrelevant to the real matter in issue. We are to be so reformed that the Clergy—it is not yet decided whether they are to be Priests or



not—will attend to their correspondence promptly, and keep the parish registers, and submit intelligible reports in a businesslike way at the close of each fiscal year. There are to be vital lectures on vital topics, some attention paid to Psychology, and we are no longer to drift along in our cynical indifference to social problems. This is splendid, and yet I venture that having done all we are unprofitable servants.

In the first place we are to train, not to educate. A Seminary is not an auxiliary college. It is not its function, *qua* Seminary, to make learned men, nor cultured men, nor morally reformed men, but to equip men with a technical scientific equipment for a highly specialized craft. It is a pity that the word "Priestcraft" has fallen to such an evil estate. We have no word with which to replace it, and so, were I speaking wisdom among the perfect I should risk the invidious connotation and say bluntly that we are to give men a scientific equipment for the practice of Priestcraft.

I believe the emphasis on the idea of training in contradistinction to that of education will prove helpful when it comes to a question of the canonical requirements for Candidates for Holy Orders, realizing that the Canon necessarily determines the major part of the curriculum of any seminary. In fact, most if not all of the objections advanced against the present provisions, as long as they are regarded as a minimum, lose their force. The subjects required by canon are required antecedently by the nature of the case, and no amount of legislation can make it otherwise.

But the Seminary is to train Priests. Now I am in for another definition, and I venture again—this time very humbly: "A Priest is a man who offers sacrifice." Of course, he does a great many other things, but the essence

of Priesthood is in this character, this power to offer sacrifice. For the present purpose the definition must be expanded to include some characteristic ancillary functions, and we may say that the Priest maintains the daily corporate prayer of the Church, administers the Tribunal of Penance and other Sacraments appropriate to his Order, preaches, and under our American practice is normally charged with the cure of souls. The significance of the definition in its original form remains unchanged. It means that a Priest does a very special sort of work, a work that requires a training specialized in a very high degree, and in providing this training, this equipment, the Seminary finds its sole reason for being.

At first glance the statement that the Seminary is to train Priests suggests something negative. It means, for instance, that we are not primarily to train Deacons, nor pastors, nor administrators, nor social service experts, nor critics nor preachers.

The reference to Deacons tempts me to an excursion. Most of the proposals with regard to the Diaconate and the assumptions underlying our present practice strike me as so thoroughly academic. It has come, I cannot imagine how, to be considered highly meritorious to insist that no one be ordered Deacon until the end of his seminary course, the pretext alleged generally has something to do with not laying on of hands suddenly, or the value of discipline supposed to be involved in delay, or the advantages of a curacy with training under an experienced priest; just as though there were the slightest possibility of one Deacon out of twenty ever serving a curacy. As a matter of fact the great majority of Deacons are placed in charge of small parishes, and are, but for the fiction, given the cure of souls and charged with all the obligations of rectorship

without any means, of grace or otherwise, to discharge them. We are not training Deacons. Even if there were curacies enough to go around, the curate ought to be practicing his Priesthood and not a business that he is expected to abandon with his novitiate. It is, with just enough exceptions to prove the rule, thoroughly bad to have Deacons out of the Seminary. We should contemplate the giving of Deacon's Orders at the end of the middle year as representing the normal practice.

And now to return to the question of the curriculum of the Seminary, having made an act of faith in the present requirements as our minimum. To say that a Priest offers sacrifice is another way of saying that he ought to know how to say Mass. With one exception, the Seminaries make no provision for this. "Liturgics" means Proctor and Frere with some knowledge of the contents of the Book of Common Prayer. Ceremonial is not taught. Some students receive instruction from outside sources and some pick it up during the course of subsequent sacerdotal adventures. This is no trivial matter. One shudders at the thought of experimenting with the Blessed Sacrament, and yet that is precisely what we make necessary. The priestly behavior in matters pertaining to the ministry of the altar is perhaps the most potent teaching element we possess. This has nothing to do with questions of "High" and "Low Church," and the seminaries should arrange in a business-like way to teach it as the science which it is. Of course, as a Catholic, I have a private objection to putting a premium on sacrilege.

The offering of sacrifice involves preparation. Now the Priest's personal spiritual preparation is, at least technically, not the affair of the Seminary, but preparation will include some external things, among them the Divine Of-



fice and the Sacrament of Penance. With regard to the first, the Seminary must bring home some sense of obligation. The Clerk in Orders must be made to realize that he is bound to the daily recitation, and that this obligation is enforced by certain sanctions of a most serious character. He ought to have some conscience, too, about the duties common to the faithful, such as assistance at Masses of obligation even in vacation time.

It is difficult to trust one's self to touch on the topic of the quantity and quality of preparation we provide for the Priest as physician of souls. Here the Candidate must learn empirically or not at all. Again, with one exception, none of the Seminaries has ever suspected that the disease of sin can be or should be treated scientifically. What a nameless tragedy this system that can profess to equip clergy and can stamp with approval graduates ignorant even of the nature of the Seal of Confession. It is needless to say that the present condition is simply scandalous, and that the most crying need of the curriculum is for the addition of courses in Moral Philosophy, Moral Theology and Casuistry.

As for the course in Theology, sometimes labelled "Dogmatic Theology," is there any Seminary in the Anglican Communion where Theology is taught dogmatically? I yield this point in despair. Anything more than a pious wish is folly in our day.

A Priest is called upon to do many things other than those that pertain to the strict exercise of his Priesthood. The Epistle for the Tenth Sunday after Trinity is illuminating here, and I think that it has been meditated to advantage by the framers of our proposed new Canon. Heretofore we have worked on the assumption that the ministry meant one type of man engaged in one type of service—pas-

torate to the average Episcopal parish. This average Episcopal parish is our procrustean bed and we are perfectly ruthless in seeing that our victims fit it. Every minister must be a preacher, an organizer, a parish administrator. The ideal has apparently been the requirements of the ghastly clerical 'want ad.' That we are beginning to see the light is an unspeakable blessing, and with the realization that "He gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers," the old system bids fair to be relegated to the company of evil memories.

Seminary religion is deadly. The life is so peculiarly seminarian; so absolutely unlike life anywhere else and under any other conditions to be found in the world, that the religious emphasis must strike the heroic note if religion is to be saved. I have ventured to suggest some problems, and these problems are of very great importance indeed, but relative to the question of religion they are insignificant. I am confident that now I have put my finger on the real difficulty, the real root of the failure of the Seminary. Should the devotional life of seminarians be designedly more intense than that of ordinary lay folk? Yes, undoubtedly—even taking the answer to mean that that which is reasonably adequate for the welfare of the spiritual life under conditions that obtain in a parish is not at all adequate here. The need is not so much for the development of the interior life of the future Priest as it is of food by the way to keep him through this strange, strained, difficult period. Of course, for his future ministry he must be accustomed to this same heroic note, since the business of one who is to give the tone to the religious life of his people is far more strenuous than it would be were it limited to the struggle for his own sanctification.

At bottom the trouble is identical with that of the average Protestant Episcopal parish. The difference is in degree, not in kind. It is the same story of dislocation and misplaced emphasis. We have divorced our worship from the altar. May I again suggest a concrete solution? I regard three things as imperative: Reservation, daily Mass, and provision for frequent access to the Sacrament of Penance. With this accomplished, I am persuaded that we may rest content, patiently expecting until all other matters be set to rights.

Can the Church tolerate the Seminary? Yes, by all means; and there is no reason why their number should not be multiplied. More seminaries would make for an increase of the Priesthood, and they can be made very effective institutions. We are obsessed with the idea of mere bigness, and with the lust of an efficiency that yields to statistical evaluation. If the seminaries are to train Priests and not to educate men with vocations for the Ministry; if they are to be frankly seminaries and not quasi-colleges, then size and income and mechanical equipment cease to be matters of primary importance. And, by the way, if some of the Religious would undertake to establish a Secular Seminary it would be invaluable if for nothing else than fixing the standard.

There is another matter that must ultimately be faced, though perhaps it is as well to leave it in the background at present. That is the question of control. I trust it is no reflection on the laity to say that any board of trustees should be predominantly clerical; better, predominantly Episcopal. Unless the control is exclusively Episcopal, and we have no such case at present, the trustees must be made to understand that they have absolutely nothing to do with the teaching. Here the universities which are grappling



with this same difficulty promise to point the way to a solution. All men are theological experts, and it is too much to expect of flesh and blood that officials with power will not attempt to make it felt in a matter that strikes home so keenly as the teaching of doctrines and views which they know infallibly to be unsound. However, teachers in Orders are much like teachers out of Orders, and first-rate men can not and will not work under censorship. Episcopal control is the ideal, perhaps impossible for a long while to come, but the one that must always be kept in view.

---

## Some Fruits of Parochialism

BY THE REV. ALBERT C. LARNED,

*Lieutenant Chaplain's Corps, U. S. N. R. F.*

"**O** YE of little faith," said our Lord to the religious leaders of His day, and such words could He use to us, the representatives of Apostolic Christianity in America. The longer I remain in the naval service of the United States, the more I am struck with the frightful extent to which parochialism has hampered the position of our Church before the great mass of unchurched Americans, so that to the great majority of men in the service the Christian religion as taught for the first thousand years of our era is unknown. While we clergy may shake our heads and claim that the responsibility is not ours, it is none the less clear that there is a far greater blame attaching to us for this state of things than we care to admit. We have thought so long in terms of the parish, whether so and so was in church on Sunday, or whether Mr. Jones made his communion, or Mrs. Jones was at such and such a meeting of the parish guild, or whether the choir boys were at-

tending to their duties, and the acolytes were on the job, that religion has become largely a matter of parochial activities and we were startled out of our sleep by the claims of a nation at war. As far as chaplains were concerned we put forth a magnificent effort at the outbreak of the war, our Church being represented in the service disproportionately to its size in the nation. But I wonder in spite of it all if my brethren in the service have been struck by the indifference displayed by the great mass of officers and men to the existence of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The few men whom I have met with who are communicants of the Church have on the whole been interested and responsive to their own Church services, particularly the Holy Communion. But when out of a crew of over 1200 men on a battleship, I could find only 45 men; or out of a regiment of 3000 Marines I found only 79 after diligent seeking; while on this ship from a ship's roster of about 400 I have discovered 10; one realizes the weakness and smallness of the Church in the sight of the vast American public.

The point that I am trying to drive at is that this condition of things is our own fault. I am not one of those pessimistic persons who seem to regard the Catholic faith, after almost two thousand years of teaching, as something belonging to a few souls. God works slowly and mysteriously according to our imperfect judgments, but He accomplishes vast results in a universe; the faith that converted thousands in early days is still operative to do the same now. Nobody who has been lately in France, and studied the conditions of religion there, can fail to be impressed by the great popularity of religion on the whole, and by the crowded churches in that country. In countries of the Roman obedience the Catholic faith draws thousands;

it is a popular religion in the true sense of the word, and wherever it has free sway it draws the people, for the most appalling thing in the world is the Religion of Jesus Christ. It is just here where we priests are so terribly to blame. We talk a great deal about democracy and the will of the people, but we do not carry it out in our churches. It is here that the apparent failure of the Episcopal Church to be the Church of the American people comes in. We have been so respectable, so conventional, so afraid of giving offense to those whose opinions are of less value than their pocketbooks. We have been in bondage, and still are, to an hypnotic suggestion that the real sin to be avoided is uncompromising definition of revealed religion, and abiding loyalty to it. The chaos of Protestantism gives us our chance; but we sit still without uttering a protest as the Government classifies us simply as "Protestants," thereby stultifying the chaplain's usefulness, and providing opportunities for our Churchmen to pass out of life without the consolations of the sacraments. Men like to hear a good talk, to sing popular hymns, to debate questions in a Bible class, I can testify to all those in the Navy; but the idea of a sacrifice being offered on their behalf whereby Christ is brought before them, a blessing which they can use for their own welfare, or for those dear to them at home or in the next world, is something that they don't know anything about. The pity of it all! After all these years of Christianity, to think that the greatest drama in history—past and present—resolves itself in their conception into a hymn-singing meeting or a debating society! No wonder then that religion is regarded in the Navy as an occasional thing, a sort of dessert to the dull routine of life aboard ship, a very excellent institution highly profitable for its moral effect, and rather social in character, but of course



only to be allowed when there is time for its exercise. As for prayer being a determining factor in the circumstances of life at sea, there may be many who think that it is, but the general atmosphere of ward-room and forecandle is against the assumption.

As I write these words here at sea in mid-ocean, rolling about on the great deep, I realize that what I say may seem exaggeration to those ashore, for the naval life being a lonely and abnormal existence gives rise to exaggerated ideas and imaginations. Yet I feel convinced that we have but touched the service of our religion, which in the past has drawn multitudes by its touch, and still draws today when given a chance. It seems to me that we have stifled the Gospel in our anxiety to make a success of parish institutions. The stranger who goes into our churches often finds a cold welcome, not because he is not wanted, but because he does not fit into the parochial life; the clergyman is too busy after the service speaking to the members of the parish to notice him. The chaplain who goes for the first time into active duty must be struck by the complete absence of everything that in the past he has been accustomed to associate with his ministry. He has no parish to look after, he has no church to celebrate in, and the only permanent piece of furniture that he has is a portable altar. But men are ever with him, men all the time, no women or children. He must present a manly appeal of the Gospel, or his hearers will have none of it. He is always confronted by the problem that his congregation consists of all kinds of Christians, with but a handful of Churchmen, that if he celebrates the Eucharist many will receive who are not prepared; that if he has a mass without careful teaching and preparation it will not be understood. If, on the contrary, there were a strong number of men to whom the

Church and its claims were well known and taken as a matter of course, what a power would be found in the ministrations of our priests in the service!

Yet, after all, whose fault is it that the Church does not appear before the American public as a strong body of united members, whose business is to propagate the faith? Not necessarily that it should be large in numbers, but how pathetic it is after all the time that has gone by since its foundation it should speak with such a divided voice, and should present such an uncertain front! As I see it the fault lies with the clergy of our Church. We cannot blame the laity, for they follow where they are led. If they see that the pastors of the flock are not uniting with all their energies on propagating the faith and establishing classes of instruction for those outside the fold; if the laity see their pastors so absorbed in their own little parishes, regarding them as the Holy Catholic Church in themselves; we need not wonder if the Church as a great propagating Society of eternal Truth necessary for salvation makes no real appeal to them. They will consider religion only as a sentimental and beautiful thing for those who have time to practice it. For either the Church is all that it claims to be, or it is merely a society valuable as an institution of artistic and historical interest. Yes, the fault lies with us, and a Naval Chaplain ventures to suggest a remedy.

Let the Church establish a Christian Propagation Society which shall be part of the Church Missionary Society. Let this organization be established in every parish and mission in the country, and let it be supported by the same means as are the other general and diocesan institutions of the Church. The literature of this society should be the Creeds, the Church Catechism, an instruction on Christian Marriage, and a general Church History from the days of

the Apostles to the present time. ' The instruction given should form the basis of every Confirmation Class, the Bishop requiring assurance that the candidate is thoroughly instructed in these fundamental formulas, and that the parish priest is making every effort to bring the attention of the community to the essential doctrines of the Christian Religion as put forward by the Christian Propagation Society. Once the American public realizes the fact that a churchless Christianity is a Christless philosophy it will seek the religion which is Christ's. But it must be convinced of the truth of the religion by the zeal and unity of its promulgators.

Lately I was talking with a naval chaplain about the Episcopal Church. My friend was a Lutheran, but like so many of his co-religionists he had freed himself from the old orthodox and churchly point of view of Lutheranism. He said that he could not understand our Church, for it was so broad that it included Roman Catholics and Unitarians. While of course the criticism was exaggerated, it is of interest as showing the opinion which a bright and intelligent Protestant theological student had of our Church: a criticism which would probably be echoed by thousands of others throughout the country. Before setting forth to cure the divisions of Christendom it would be fitting for us to heal ourselves; not of the rightful differences of opinion about unessential matters, or of differences in ritual and customs; but we should drop overboard for good anything that is untrue to the Anglican mission in the world—to set forth the Catholic and Apostolic faith of primitive and undivided Christianity. These are days of great things in the world when the eyes of all are turned towards the League of Nations as the hope of humanity. Why may not the eyes of the Christian world be



turned towards the Anglican Communion as the hope of all who love freedom and truth, who see in our branch of the Catholic Church a league of parishes united in propagating the fundamentals of the faith?

---

## Lecture Platform or Pulpit?

BY CLERE UNWIN.

A FRIEND and the writer, recent converts to the Christian religion, were speaking about matters religious in the library of a New York university. Having both made our way, some years before, from Mombasa to the Victoria Lake in British East Africa, our minds travelled to Kikuyu. Something occurred there which was the affair of every baptized person in the Church of England. We differed as to the result of the Bishop's Conference regarding that vital issue. A theological seminary being near, we decided to seek its library files for further information. I ransacked the files while she explored the literature on the magazine table. We discussed Kikuyu later. What consumed us with curiosity were copies of *The Hobo News*; *The Real Democracy*; *The Liberator*; *The Labor Defender*; *The Arbitrator*; *Reconstruction*; *Carry On*; *Signs of the Times*; *The German-Bolshevik Conspiracy*; *Congressional Record*; *School Life*; *The Nation*; *The New Republic*; *The New Appeal* (with glaring headlines "Do we want to keep the railroads; if so, then get ready for a big fight!"); and various other secular literature not to be seen in home libraries. We made a survey and found no headlines on "What do you know about the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ? What do you know of His supreme authority as the final revelation of God to man?" Neither

did we find such books as "The Wine of God," or "Self-Revelations of our Lord." These may have been resting on the shelves somewhere as exhibits. We had a talk with a student who agreed that because such literature seemed to attract the attention of some studying for the ministry one heard less about the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. He remarked that the morning session had been taken up with the subject of "The Socialism of Jesus."

There is a great responsibility resting upon those who are preparing for the ministry of the priesthood. Whether the convert be a native of Africa or Kalamazoo, he does need enlightenment as to what is the real teaching of Christ about the Church which He established and he instinctively longs for precisely the kind of Church created by our Lord. How well-informed a priest of God may be about current events,—how much he may know of art or cathedrals in or out of the war zone, interests the convert to Christianity not at all. There is something very attractive in knowing where one stands, whether that standing be right or wrong. That is, it is important to be able to give an intelligent reason for the hope that is within one—often there may be nothing about which to be intelligent and very often there may be no hope—but at any rate, it is not stupid. One does not bombard one's lawyer for this information—one seeks the Church. There is a danger, a subtle one, that the Church in becoming so broad may end in becoming so vague that its views are worthless. It is of the utmost importance to the convert to the Christian religion that when he goes to a church or cathedral, he should know he is in a place of worship and not at the movies. If he is a person who cares for lectures or talks on affairs of the moment, he will or may go elsewhere. Let those whose business it is to instruct and pass on the Truth of the Liv-

ing God talk about it—preach about it—so any child may understand.

“How to make the Church more masculine” (this is a subject for a cathedral congregation), how to make it more feminine, indeed how to make it anything more than the Lord Jesus Christ taught it should be—who has the time or interest to attend such a meeting? To those of us who have little actual knowledge of what the Church does teach—little experimental acquaintance—are we attracted to these side-shows? Rather were it better to remain in the quiet of one’s room and study the service of the Communion. What Mohammedan would go to a mosque to be enlightened upon industrial unrest? What Buddhist would go to a temple to discuss or hear discussed the latest railway strike? Why should Christians be invited to listen to almost every subject but the Christian religion in a church? There are exceptions, happily, there are churches to which one may go and learn divine teachings, where one may go for worship. They are few. More worship, less talk; more discipline, less laxity; more faith, less speculation; more masses, fewer orations,—this is what would attract those who desire to know for what the Holy Catholic Church stands. “What we owe to China”; very good. Tell us about it in Carnegie Hall. What we owe to Jesus Christ; tell us in church. If the church is to be converted into a concert hall and the pulpit into a lecture platform, then indeed, Buddhism is alluring from an esoteric view.



# For What Does the Prayer Book Stand?

BY THE REV. HENRY K. PIERCE.

**I**T is the custom to express scorn for presuppositions, to speak as if lines of thought based on them were biased and prejudiced. As a matter of fact we can do extremely little thinking without them, they govern our daily lives,—from the truth of the multiplication table to the probable veracity of one's friend. In writing a paper on the theology of the Book of Common Prayer I am going to presuppose two things: (1) that the Anglican Communion is a true part of the Catholic Church, and (2) that all her loyal communicants long to see her united once more with the rest of the Catholic Church.

Taking our first presupposition, which is a firm conviction and not open to question by those within our communion, we can arrive at certain positive truths regarding the Book of Common Prayer. In the first place, as it is the one and only public service book of a portion of the Catholic Church, it must supply at least the minimum of matter for the public worship of God required by Catholic theology. And, secondly, whatever theology appears in it must be Catholic theology. If any of its contents seem to tolerate various interpretations, the true interpretation will be that which conforms to Catholic theology. For Anglo-Catholics these statements stand as axiomatic; an apologetic directed to those without would be forced to prove them.

Examination of the offices of the book confirms our axioms. It contains forms for the two sacraments generally necessary for salvation, which are sufficient when compared with the many rites of the rest of the Catholic Church, now or in the past. There is an or-

dinal recognizing the Catholic, three-fold, apostolic ministry and with adequate rites for bestowing it. The sacraments of confirmation and holy matrimony are recognized and provided for. Penance is referred to and guardedly counselled. Holy unction is entirely omitted. We have a weak defense for this serious omission by arguing that the book is essentially one of *public* services (with some other matter added in the way of accretion), and that unction,—a private service,—need not appear in it. We thus have witness in the book to six of the seven sacraments of Catholic theology, and no denial of the missing seventh one. We have the two necessary creeds and a Catholic expansion and interpretation of them in the shape of a catechism. The doctrine of the communion of saints is recognized to a certain extent by the calendar with its commemorations. The constant use of Biblelections shows forth the rule of faith,—the Church to teach and the Bible to prove. Daily matins and evensong are evidence of belief in the need for constant praise and worship of God.

So much for the sufficiency of our book. It fulfills the theological requirements demanded of a complete book for the public worship of a portion of the Catholic Church. Does that mean that we must, in loyalty, be proud of it and think it beyond improvement? I believe not, and it is here that my second presupposition comes in. We long to see Our Lord's prayer answered, to see the separated portions of the Catholic Church united once more. And, even with the friendly Easterns, our Prayer Book is one of the hindrances. They justly fault it with omissions, with ambiguities, and with minimizing. The following criticisms are made by Easterns and Romans both, and every one of them has to do with theology:

(1) In our mass there is no sufficiently plain statement of the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood; there is no explicit sacrificial phraseology; there are no plain, old-fashioned commemorations of the saints, and no prayers for the dead.

(2) In our ordinal the preaching office is disproportionately stressed; there is no mention of sacrificing for quick and dead; the old ceremonies, such as the tradition of the instruments,—so beautiful and so full of doctrinal significance,—are missing; and the minor orders are totally ignored.

(3) Forms for the sacraments of unction and penance should be supplied. For, after all, though the book purports to be one of public services, still it has grown into a practical compendium of all the rites of our communion and therefore it should be really complete.

(4) Our total neglect of the blessed dead must end. They must be remembered plainly in the mass and there must be provision for requiems.

(5) The holy saints. At present we are supposed to content ourselves with blessing GOD for them and praying to be helped by their examples. The rest of catholic Christendom is not now, and never has been, so contented. From the days of the catacombs down the saints have been prayed to. The collects of the Roman missal and breviary, with characteristic restraint, ask God to accept the intercessions of the saints for us. The East goes further, and many of the saints' days' collects are addressed directly to the saint being commemorated. We are western and western ways are our ways. Let us not be afraid to ask Our Father that we "may be holpen by their intercessions," and let us restore the glorious army, apostles, martyrs, virgins, confessors, to our ponderous litany.



These five groups sum up the principal short-comings in our book. Some would say, and do say, "Give us back our old service books." Perhaps that will come in time, but at present it cannot be thought of. We have travelled too far away from them, and many are too fondly attached to the present substitute. Some of these points are already being considered. We are always hearing of "enrichment," etc., and there is always objection to the changes proposed. Why? Precisely because *theology* is involved. Let us consider the true nature of the objections to such changes as those outlined above, abstracting irrelevant side issues from the objections, and I believe they will all reduce to *theological* difficulties,—difficulties of two sorts, the one kind in the mind of the objector himself, and the other the supposed difficulty which the objector anticipates in the minds of others. Now as to the first of these I do not know how to argue. Why should any true Catholic object, *on his own account*, to plain and explicit Catholic teaching and practice in his public worship? Surely he cannot. And the objections of one who does not hold and practise the Catholic religion, though heard with all courtesy, scarcely can be given much weight. Do we take the advice of a Christian Scientist in constructing a hospital? Is the "conscientious objector" consulted regarding the details of military tactics?

Now what about the second sort of objections,—those based on the anticipated difficulties of others, either within or outside of our communion? It is a question of apologetics, you see; but that means, in the end, theology. Take an example: the doctrine of the Real Presence is a part of Catholic theology; our communion announces itself an integral part of the Catholic Church. What shall we say to a communicant who cannot tolerate a point-blank teach-

ing,—by the form of words and by the accompanying ceremonies,—of that Presence on the altar at mass? Of course he believes at present that the doctrine is not there in the book. Is it a requirement of Christian charity to leave him ignorant as to this portion of saving truth; to be so tender of his prejudices as to prefer keeping him, though under a misapprehension, to losing him because of a plain statement of truth? I think not. I think that would be an illustration of that perverted and in-growing modern “charity” which Mr. Chesterton talks of, transferred from men to ideas.

And the outsider, whom we wish to convert and bring inside to share the blessings of our holy religion, what of him? He finds the Real Presence a gross and impossible absurdity, praying to the blessed saints mere idolatry, the sacrament of penance a confirmation of his belief that Catholics are morbid sentimentalists, holy unction an interesting archæological survival. Are we to brandish these red rags before him on the printed pages of our Prayer Book? It seems to me that we must if we are to treat him honestly. We surely want no converts who join us under a misapprehension, even though we believe the misapprehension temporary. We have now too many nominal members who have joined us with anything but the thought of becoming members of the Holy Catholic Church; who have taken that unfortunate word Protestant on our title page at its current face value; and whose anti-Catholic sensitiveness is not even ruffled by the guarded language of our book.

I think we, who accept my first presupposition, sometimes forget how very guarded the language of our book is. The foundation fact,—that this a part of the Catholic Church,—colors all our use of it; and should color it. But remember that thousands constantly use it,—and they are

not all ignorant or insincere,—who can see nothing in its contents about the Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, who would be shocked if told that serious sin normally requires sacramental confession, and who would recoil with horror at the thought of praying to our Lady. We can thank God for Cramer's majestic English, but his skill in balancing was not confined to phrases.

And is plain teaching such bad apologetics after all? There are many who believe that we are entering an age when men demand something very positive in their religion. The negative religion of Protestantism is dying. Its followers are dropping all religion or solacing their spiritual cravings with Christian Science or Ethical Culture or Spiritism, or bustling activities for the "greatest good of the greatest number." But some are turning towards the Catholic Church. Men come back from France, unconvinced about God perhaps, but at any rate tired of negations, hating shams and make-shifts and compromises and *safeness*. They will have no more use for diluted theology than for diluted patriotism. In all departments of life they ask one to show one's colors. To one such, who is interested in religion, wouldn't it be better policy to show a Prayer Book which flatly says what the Church believes so that the first comer is left in no doubt? What matter if liturgies in the fourth century were far from explicit? Heresy had not then arisen and there was no need to emphasize universally accepted doctrine. But for centuries that happy state has been only a memory. We are not living in the fourth century but the twentieth, heirs of the happy activities of Luther and Calvin and Cranmer and Huxley and Spencer and Schweitzer and Harnack. All our doctrines are disputed where they are not contemptuously ignored. To insist on maintaining vague and indefinite formularies of worship because the primitive rites were reticent in teach-



ing is like demanding a return to the primitive simplicity of the days before the creeds were written. It cannot be done. Our truths are denied. We cannot take acceptance for granted. Would it not be better propaganda, as well as more honest, to remove the ambiguities and compromises, to drop the minimizing and to supply the tactful omissions, —to show our true colors to the world?

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Sainthood: Retreat Addresses.* By Rev. Jesse Brett, L.Th. Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1919. \$1.50 net.

We have come to know and value Fr. Brett's books, because of their thorough insight and teaching about the spiritual life. The point of view of the book under consideration is expressed in the opening sentence, "The Christian who would become a saint must be an idealist in personal religion." And the author feels that the experience of the great war adds force to the necessity for idealism among mankind, expressed in religion. He gives a reasonable, insistent call to the highest. "Spiritual greatness is within the reach of every Catholic."

The ideal, penitence, our relation to God, prayer, the expectation, the power and the reward of saintliness—these are set forth in intimate relation to common life and daily contact with the world. "God and the soul are concerned together in a great matter—the sanctification of an immortal." We are warned against the influences that "lie outside the order of Catholic life, though offering consolations to suffering and sorrowing hearths." If we are true to our own state and place today, we need look no further to find the path to holiness.

The book will benefit all who desire to live the Christian life, and who have ideals for themselves and their souls.

---

*Fair Play for the Workers.* By Percy Stickney Grant, D.D. Moffat Yard and Company.

The rector of the Church of the Ascension has given us a readable and a cogent book. Most people know Dr. Grant as a very bold innovator in things ecclesiastical, a kind of *enfant terrible*, but not everyone is aware of the seriousness and depth of his studies and activities in the sphere of sociology. The present volume is an attempt to put before conservatives

some of the positions of labor, from the historical point of view. The book is then not an emotional riot but a careful criticism of some sides of the present increasing maladjustment of society and the causes.

A prominent radical said the other day to a group of Church people that he was aware how large an amount of radicalism there is in the Church but that the American public could not by any means be called radical. The columns of democracy are forming with lightning rapidity the world over and America lags; Winston Churchill wrote in the *New York Times* recently after visiting Europe: "Today it is safe to say we have become the most conservative of the nations of the western world. We were once the most radical." The rub is that we have forms of representative government—actually delegated government—which in an earlier time when everyone was a farmer made for a good measure of political and real democracy, but times have changed and large masses of people now feel that their only hope of well-being lies in industrial and economic democracy. It is interesting to learn that during a large part of the middle ages the government of London and the great English boroughs included the industrial worker with all his problems and complaints. Fair play for the worker must come by the state's caring for his physical betterment, by making laws fit both rich and poor, by preventing the waste of ignorance and competition, by a mental adjustment through organized efforts for free speech, by giving the worker what he craves, sure work at all times and a due return for his labor. The theories of trade unions, the Industrial Workers of the World, and Socialism are discussed ably and with broad sympathy. The place of the Church in economics is thought to be an important one; Dr. Grant is not one of those who think that the Episcopal Church should meddle neither with politics nor religion. All adventurous Churchmen today are aware of the great yearning for religion in the hearts of men, and the churches would be filled again and showered with boxes of ointment, if the Church concerned Herself with the way people earn their daily bread—as She did, let us remember, in the days of Basil, Ambrose and Tertullian and in the artistic days of virile monasticism. One very moderate way of coming in touch with workers and their needs is by means of the Open or Public Forum; one was started at the Church of the Ascension in 1907. Great things in the way of education and fellowship can be thus achieved; ignorance on both sides is colossal. The worker may there learn that the vestryman—usually a bondholder—will help initiate the social revolution if he is only convinced of the facts and shown the right method. And as for the uplift to the privileged, why you ought to hear

a young Russian immigrant talk, one of the charming, intelligent kind, full of idealism and Christian in everything but name. I know lots of Jews who would be Christians and Churchmen if they could be convinced that the Communion of Saints were something more than a blessed word Mesopotamia. Dr. Grant may be a heretic in things theological—I do not know—but he is quite orthodox as regards our duty to our neighbor, if one measures orthodoxy by reference to the Apostolic Fathers, and if one counts the Incarnation—as did Bishop Westcott—as being a revelation of human duties. There is a way to cure our social maladjustment when we care enough about it to think it through. Socialism and other radical movements are not final but suggestive, looking towards a new world. The pity of it is that most Churchmen have no plan at all except the wretched doctrine of *laissez-faire*, which was cast on the scrap-heap along with a lot of other heirlooms by the exigencies of the late war. The author suggests that the way out is to go on doing things in a corporate way as we have done during the war, only more so. The book is very illuminating for those who do not have any opinions on economic questions except what they find in newspaper editorials. We have here a sane and well-balanced presentation of the subject. But what a well-bred way some people have of saying things that others get put in jail for twenty years for saying. We all want peace, industrial no less than international; the author quotes in the preface the wise words of Emerson in "The Progress of Culture," "When classes are exasperated against each other, the peace of the world is always kept by striking a new note." Are our possessing and privileged ones doing this thing notably? Are they, as the book suggests, "good sports" in this large way after they leave the stadium and the crew? The book has a good appendix and a fine bibliography but no index.

ALBERT FARR.

---

*The Religion of the Prayer Book.* By the Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., and the Rev. Selden P. Delany, D.D.

This book seems to me to fill a real need. The chapters on Protestantism, Papalism and Catholicity, the English Reformation, the Powers of Local Churches, discuss in short compass a great many of the problems that people are thinking about and that would require very considerable reading to clear them up.

The book then takes up the principle of interpretation of the Book of Common Prayer and shows how thoroughly Catholic it is, and that in everything of primary importance it speaks with no uncertain sound.



There are a great many helpful suggestions in regard to Confirmation and the Eucharist, and some questions, like Reservation, that are being discussed at present, are very well handled.

There is no other book that I know of that exactly covers the same ground, and things are stated in such a way as not to antagonize people, so that the book can be used where other books of somewhat the same character would be useless. It is very readable and at times there are delightful bits of humor that one does not always find in so theological a book.

WILLIAM WALTER WEBB.

---

*Worship and Music.* Suggestions for Clergy and Choirmasters. By the Venerable George Gardner, M.A., Mus.Bac., Archdeacon of Aston and Chancellor of Birmingham Cathedral. With a prefatory note by the Bishop of Oxford. London, S. P. C. K. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1918. 78 pages. \$1.00.

How the art of music may be used to most advantage in the services of our churches, is the theme of this little book. The author is a thorough musician and a priest of wide experience, and his suggestions are both apt and practical. His discussion of the matters dealt with is lucid and terse, and his style without technicalities. One wishes that every layman in the American Church, as well as every priest and choirmaster, might peruse the book.

Morning and Evening Prayer and the Eucharist are dealt with in some detail, with suggestions as to style of music to be used and manner of performance. There is a considerable discussion of the singing of the Psalms, but one feels that many of the difficulties mentioned would vanish were the ancient Psalm Tones to replace the "ordinary *Anglican* way." Two chapters are devoted to the important matter of "Hymns and Hymn Tunes." The author indulges in some trenchant criticism of the Stainer-Dykes-Barnby-Monk school, and the "sentimental picturesqueness" of many of the tunes which have attained such wide vogue during the past half-century. What happier results might have been achieved in the newly revised Hymnal, had this little book been in the hands of every member of the Commission before entering upon his work!

The Bishop of Oxford, in his Prefatory Note, lists a number of "points" on which he would "vote urgency for speedy reforms": that choral devotions in the vestry should be abolished; that when the Eucharist is sung, still a great part of the service should be said; that a severe limit should be set both to the length and number of hymns; that in a great many churches the worst place from which to lead the singing is

the chancel, and that a crowded chancel does more than anything else to destroy the dignity of the altar, etc., most of which points are well covered in the body of the book. The Bishop adds that "this little book ought to be read by clergy, organists, choirmen and women, and by Churchmen generally."

---

*Psychic Tendencies of Today.* By Alfred W. Martin, A.M., S.T.B. D. Appleton & Co., 1918.

This book is of interest to that great and constantly growing class of readers who have turned their thoughts chiefly towards the contemplation of the psychic. Dr. Martin writes from the standpoint of a leading member of the Society of Ethical Culture, which gives his book the charm of a relatively unfamiliar point of view.

In the first part of the book he discusses in general terms the modern interest in psychic phenomena. In the second part, by the method of contrast and comparison he discusses hypnotism, psychotherapy, Christian Science and similar systems. In the third part of the book Sir Oliver Lodge's "Raymond" is discussed. The interest is centred chiefly in the second part.

Interesting points are these: "And this suggests a fourth explanation for . . . psychic movements, viz., the intense revulsion from those forbidding doctrines ardently accepted in the middle of the last century—a God filled with implacable wrath . . . posterity cursed and doomed . . . the wrath of God appeased only by an adequate atoning sacrifice . . ." (p. 13). He explains the rise of the Ethical Movement in 1876 as due to the same causes which brought these current psychic movements into existence (p. 23).

The writer gives the key to his own personal point of view on page 28, i. e., "to abstain 'from all malice and wrath and anger, *speaking the truth in love.*'"

The pages devoted to Christian Science (37 ff.) are singularly illuminating; even this kindly and sweet-natured writer restrains his quality of patience with difficulty.

The book is very well worth reading, because it gives brief and adequate summaries of most of the best-known current psychic systems and is written throughout in a scholarly style and without any perceptible bias.

H. S. W.

---

*The Increase of God.* By A. H. McNeile, D.D. With an introduction by the Bishop of London. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1919. Price \$1.20.



This is the book that the Bishop of London recommended for reading during this Lent. It must be by this time that such a practice has become wide-spread, as it is a yearly practice in the diocese of London. The subject is the expression of the life of God developing in the human soul. The theme is well worked out. We may refer to a point or two in the discussion. Dr. McNeile lays stress on the truth that the notion of religion simply as "being good" is a relic of Judaism; and again, the Semitic attitude that all life is sharply divided into sacred and secular. He says, "I believe that this primitive idea is one of the underlying reasons why the British nation, as a nation, is not Christian." Of the naturally moral, non-religious man it is remarked, "If God is personal, He wants the response of persons; if He is Love, He longs to receive love; and He is not getting it from the man who is not religious, however naturally good-hearted he may be." There will be very grave danger in the way the author lays stress on the obvious fact that in a sense religious actions are not ends, but means. The following is surely liable to misconstruction: "Religion is *not* saying prayers, or going to church, or reading the Bible, or attending meetings, or being confirmed, or receiving the Holy Communion."

The writer of these lines cannot forbear saying that a very distinct impression remains after reading books of this sort, that they are quite beyond the capacity of most of those whom we are anxious to teach. The infinite wisdom of God left the sacraments and the universal instinct and language of prayer, for the perfecting of the saints. They are the direct means of approach to God, wherein He speaks to the soul. He deals with simplicity, coming to the soul in each means of grace, as each soul has need. The inexperienced child and the greatest philosopher equally fail to exhaust the depths of divine love, let us say, in Absolution or in the Blessed Sacrament. We must concentrate upon these inexhaustible wells of grace, first. It was meant for us to do so. When our people have come to love the sacraments and to frequent them as the good God intended they should, then may come a time that they can profitably benefit by books of general devotion. But it seems for the present that such treatises are too diffusive, too vague, too specialized, too likely to scatter and theorize our attention, rather than concentrate it upon the ordered channels of grace. A good repentance is safer than the knowledge of social ethics; a devout communion better than precocity in exegesis. And they are surely more pleasing to God.

P. R. F.